

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. XLVIII, No. 23
WHOLE No. 1224

March 11, 1933

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	537-540
EDITORIALS	
Bankers and Brigands—The Slave Wage— The Newest Amendment—False Education— A Dent in the Brown Derby—The Disappear- ing Classics	541-543
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Lent and God's Providence—Puritanism in Greater Boston—The Decay of Party Loyalty —The Pope and the Corporations—Workers of the Land	544-551
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF	551-552
BACK OF BUSINESS	552
EDUCATION	
P. S. Old Mother Hubbard	553-554
SOCIOLOGY	
A Compulsory Work-Sharing Plan	554-555
POETRY	
Lights of Home	555
DRAMATICS	
Catholic Amateurs and the Play	556-557
REVIEWS	557-559
COMMUNICATIONS	560

Chronicle

Home News.—Following the bank moratorium declared in Michigan, Governor Ritchie of Maryland declared on February 24 that the next day would be a legal holiday, and proposed to make daily proclamations to the same effect until the banking situation was cleared up.

Banking Holidays

In the next few days, banking holidays had been declared, for varying periods, in the States of Alabama, California, Kentucky, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Tennessee, while in Ohio, Delaware, Arkansas, Mississippi, Indiana, and Pennsylvania steps were taken to enable banks to limit withdrawals to a small percentage of the amount deposited. In Idaho, the Governor was authorized to proclaim legal holidays whenever conditions justify; in Minnesota an emergency act enabled the State Commissioner of Banks to authorize State banks to suspend business for short periods. On February 28, West Virginia approved a bill permitting bank holidays "as being necessary because of similar action in neighboring States."—In order to protect deposits in national banks, which might be endangered as a result of such bank holidays, Congress on February 25 passed the Couzens amendment to the national-banking law, which President Hoover signed. The amendment will enable the President,

through the Controller, to exercise for six months the same authority on national banks as is held by State officials in respect to State banks. This power may be extended by the President for another six months if necessary.

On February 23, Mr. Roosevelt confirmed the rumored appointment of George H. Dern for Secretary of War, and also announced that Representative Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona, would be Director of the Budget. He made additional announcements until February 28, when his Cabinet was completed, being the same as the tentative list published in our last issue.—On March 2, Senator Thomas J. Walsh, one of the two Catholics chosen for the Cabinet, died suddenly, presumably of a heart attack, while en route by train to Washington, D. C. Homer S. Cummings, of Connecticut, was named Attorney General, but only temporarily, it was reported.

On February 28, by a vote of 188 to 183, the House passed the Smith bill, providing for the purchase by the Government of all surplus cotton stocks owned by Government agencies, or upon which money has been loaned, and their resale to farmers who agree to reduce their cotton acreage this year by at least thirty per cent. The bill received the final approval of both Houses on March 1 and went to the President. On March 1, the House passed the Senate amendment to the bankruptcy act, allowing individuals, farmers, and railroads to make voluntary readjustments of their debts without recourse to formal bankruptcy, and the measure was sent to the President. The House also approved on March 1 the conference report on the Treasury-Postoffice appropriation bill, which carries broad powers for reorganization of the Government by the President. On the same day, its Judiciary Committee approved a bill authorizing the Federal courts, under the bankruptcy laws, to postpone for ten years, if necessary, payments of interest, sinking-fund payments, or payments of other indebtedness of cities of not less than 50,000 population.—On March 1, the Senate passed the Hull-Walcott bill, suspending farm foreclosures for two years. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee continued its stock-market investigations, and the committee studying economic conditions concluded its hearings on February 28.—At a Democratic caucus held on March 2, Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois, was chosen Speaker of the next House, and Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, floor leader, defeating Mr. Garner's candidates for these positions.

Congress

Austria.—Fear was expressed in Vienna of the possible deluge of Socialists and Communists from Germany, should the rumors of the massacre of the Reds by the Nazis be verified.—No relief was in sight for Austria's industrial revival. Inability to admit imports from other countries has practically closed all doors to its exports.—Austria found itself in the humiliating position of being obliged to submit to severe criticism from France because of the illegal shipments of military equipment through Austrian territory from Italy to Hungary. France seemed to fear that Austria was preparing with Hungary to return to the pre-War alliance with Italy and Germany.

Bolivia.—It was reported on March 1 that Bolivia had accepted in principle and with reservations the proposals of the ABC-Peru group for renewing peace negotiations with Paraguay. In a note to the Foreign Ministers at Argentina, Bolivia expressed confidence that the ABC group would act in harmony with the Commission of Neutrals at Washington.—According to a report from the General Staff on March 1 a hard battle was fought in the Toledo sector. It was reported that several important Paraguayan outposts were taken.

Chile.—With the arrest of numerous leaders of the Chilean Workers Federation on February 25 the police discovered documents that revealed an extensive Communist plot. It was revealed that the movement was intended to spread to the principal Chilean provinces and would involve the lower ranks of the army and the crews of vessels in Valparaiso Bay. No little apprehension was being felt in diplomatic circles over the strained relations between Chile and Bolivia arising out of the interpretation of the treaty of 1904. The Bolivian Government held that the treaty allowed free passage through Chilean ports of all merchandise, including war materials of every description. The Chilean Government on the other hand maintained that the treaty did not cover war material and that the transit of such materials would in future require explicit permission.

Germany.—Recent events showed how completely Chancellor Adolf Hitler was in the saddle, aided by several new executive decrees of drastic nature. President von Hindenburg permitted the Chancellor to declare martial law in Berlin, which led to the absorbing of the Nazi storm troops into the regular police departments. The President also issued an executive decree against all forms of treason and rebellion. Chancellor Hitler without delay issued most severe repressive measures threatening and silencing all opposition on the eve of the great national balloting.

On Monday, February 27, an incendiary fire broke out in the Reichstag building, an expensive structure but

without architectural appeal. Capt. Hermann Wilhelm Goering, Minister without portfolio, with Chancellor Hitler and Vice-President von Papen, rushed to the scene. Captain Goering immediately reported that it was a Communists' plot and the sign for a Red revolution. All Communist members of the Reichstag and many of the prominent Socialists were arrested; all their newspapers were suppressed, and the Reich guarantees in regard to private property, personal liberty, freedom of the press, secrecy of postal communication, and the right to hold meetings and form associations were suspended. Severe penalties were threatened against all news agencies sending out stories, whether true or false, that could be interpreted as harmful to the present Government. On many sides the extreme measures used by Chancellor Hitler with almost dictatorial power were interpreted as almost equivalent to a *coup d'état* by the National Socialists.

Great Britain.—In the House of Lords, members of the Labor party attacked the Government on the policy, which the National Government had been following—of extending its powers at the expense of Parliament. Lord Arnold spoke specifically against the plan of sending Prime Minister MacDonald to Washington to discuss the debt problem. His claim was that the Prime Minister would be judged an equal negotiator with President Roosevelt, whereas Mr. MacDonald would have far less authority than Mr. Roosevelt. Lord Ponsonby continued the subject by complaining that the Foreign Minister assumed "unfettered discretion in international affairs" and that Parliament would be "ignored in debt negotiations and it will have no power to alter whatever the Government commits the country to at the disarmament and world economic conference."

Hungary.—The grave financial situation, combined with the many-sided political intrigues which were at work in Central Europe, made the burden of Premier Julius Goemboes difficult and hazardous. The problem of finding markets for the abundance of Hungary's exports was aggravated by the jealousy and self-interest of the other European Powers, particularly France. The slight margin held by the Premier and his party made the by-elections so intensely factional that frequent riots and signs of brutality became common at the polls. Foreign journalists were ruthlessly excluded from witnessing the scenes or making a report.

India.—Both in Great Britain as in India the question of the new Constitution was becoming critical. In India, the problem was that of the acceptance of the Constitution by Mahatma Gandhi and the National Congress; without the cooperation of this overwhelmingly Nationalistic movement, the proposed Constitution could be imposed

Burning of Reichstag Building

Communists Exiles

Peace Negotiations

Communist Plot Revealed

Martial Law

Lords Criticize Cabinet

Premier's Problems

Proposed Constitution

only with great difficulty. In Great Britain, the National Government, principally through the activities of Sir Samuel Hoare, Secretary for India, was diligent in preparing the Constitution for presentation to Parliament. A White Paper on the Constitution was expected to be published in March, and the bill on India was scheduled for introduction to Parliament about October. Extremists among the Conservatives took every opportunity to obstruct the Government policy. A motion in opposition, to the effect that "the establishment of responsible government for all India on the principles of Western democracy will be injurious at the present time to Indian welfare, to British trade, and to the strength of the Empire," was defeated. But the extreme Tories, it was felt, were strong enough seriously to embarrass the Government policies.

Ireland.—President de Valera took the first opportunity, upon the reassembly of the Dail on March 1, to present a motion for the abolition of the oath of allegiance to the British Crown. It was passed by a vote of 75 to 49. The oath bill went to the Senate. Even though that body does not pass it, it will become law within sixty days. In the last Parliament the Dail passed the bill, but the Senate rejected it; upon this second recommitment, the Senate is constitutionally unable to prevent the bill's adoption. Mr. Cosgrave's party, Cumann na nGaedheal, opposed the bill on the grounds that it was a violation of the treaty with Great Britain.—The Opposition attacked the Government, without avail, on the dismissal of Gen. Owen O'Duffy, Commissioner of Police. The action had political significance, but it was taken because of current differences of policy between the Government and him rather than because of his former hostilities to the Republicans.—From a statement called forth by an inquiry of Frank McDermott, Center party leader, President de Valera did not profess himself prepared to take steps for early union with the Six County area. He expressed an opinion, and it was similar to that often expressed by Mr. Cosgrave, that the Free State aim was to secure such independence and prosperity that Ulster would wish to unite with the Free State.

Manchukuo.—Continuing their terrific drive towards the Jehol capital, the Japanese made notable gains during the week. On February 25, Chaoyang, the second largest city of Jehol Province, fell before the great Japanese-Manchukuoan offensive. The capture of this city, where a large Chinese force held a position of great natural strength, was a surprise to foreign military observers. In the meantime Gen. Heijiro Hattori, Commander of the Fourteenth Japanese Brigade, crossed the border into Jehol and after breaking down the stubborn resistance of Chinese Volunteers succeeded in capturing Lingyuan, an important key town some seventy miles from Jehol City. About the same time another wing of the Japanese army, the formidable Fourth Cavalry Brigade of General Mogi,

took Chihfeng. These conquests were accompanied by a great loss of life. To the usual hardships of war were added those coming from the intense cold of sub-zero weather. The capture of Chihfeng, an important industrial and transportation center of the Jehol Province, gave the Japanese a direct route over a good road to the capital. With the capture of Lingyuan and Chihfeng, it was believed, nothing would now prevent the advance of the Japanese to the Jehol capital.

Mexico.—Religious persecution continued, and in the State of Jalisco conditions steadily grew worse. In Guadalajara on February 16 four priests were arrested by the police. Catholics assembled in great numbers to protest the arrests, and later two were released. One of the priests still held was Father Betancourt, who was preaching in the Church of San Felipe before about 500 people when the police entered the church and arrested him on the charge that his sermon was considered subversive. A few days previous, they had raided a convent in Guadalajara and arrested sixteen Sisters.

Rumania.—Reports of uprisings and violence in some of the industrial centers, particularly during the strike in the Astro-Romano Oil Company, led to the rumor that a revolution was about to break and that King Carol was preparing to leave the country. While the economic conditions led to much unemployment in Rumania as elsewhere, it was very evident that the loyalty of the people to their king was never in question. Premier Vaida-Voevod and all his powerful National Peasant party were strongly behind the king, and even the Liberals were cooperating in Government measures. It was said that the martial law in the five industrial centers was directed as much against Nationals as against radicals. The sensational stories concerning Mme. Lupescu were flatly denied.

Russia.—Two decrees were published on February 26. That affecting agriculture provided for loans of 350,000 tons of seed grain to socialized farms in the Ukraine and 263,000 tons to the same in the Kuban region of the North Caucasus. The industrial decree ordered that various types of major industrial products, as locomotives, generators, etc., which heretofore have been imported, must now be supplied by domestic industry. At the same time, fears were expressed as to the continued increase of apathy on the part of the peasant population, which was holding up the seed supply.

Disarmament.—In a vote in the general disarmament commission on February 23 twenty-one votes were cast, including those of the United States, Great Britain, and most of the Europeans, for the French plan of putting all the armies of Europe on a standardized militia basis; five for the Italian compromise proposal, while Germany was

Oath Bill Passed

Persecution in Jalisco

King Carol Undisturbed

Farms and Industry

Japanese Take Key Cities

Germany Outvoted

alone in voting against it. A bitter fight as to the application of this principle to overseas effectives was in store. In the meanwhile, Premier Daladier of France succeeded, by staking everything on a vote of confidence, in forcing through the French Senate a reduction of 500,000,000 francs (\$19,725,000) in armament expenditures.

The end of the flurry excited by the shipment of rifles from Italy to Hungary via Hirtenberg in Austria seemed in sight. Chancellor Dolfuss of Austria suspended on

Hirtenberg Affair

February 23 Egon Seefehlner, general director of the Austrian State railroads, on the charge of having smuggled the rifles into Hungary after the Chancellor had promised to send them back to Italy. With this, the French Minister to Vienna, Count Clauzel, stated that Austria need not now reply to the Franco-British note of February 11, and hopes were entertained that now Austria would receive its Lausanne loan.

International Economics.—On February 23, the Bank of England reported a week's gain in gold of £10,036,000; the largest gain since July 24, 1931. This was attributed,

February Gold

however, not to improved conditions in England but to deterioration abroad. In the United States, in February, \$174,491,203 was lost by earmarking for foreign countries. The French gold reserve was decreased by 260,000,000 francs in February.

League of Nations.—With the Assembly in solemn session on February 24, Japan took the drastic step of walking out of the League in the person of its delegation.

Japan Withdraws

The only speaker, Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, of China, told of the Nanking Government's rejection of Japan's ultimatum to it. A vote was then taken up on the first report ever submitted to the Assembly under Article XV, paragraph 4 of the Covenant. All delegations voted "Yes" save Siam which abstained, and Japan, which voted "No." Yosuke Matsuoka, chief Japanese delegate, then left the hall, with a brief statement of regret, followed by the other members of the delegation. China, in the person of Dr. Yen, had professed entire adherence to the report.

Japan's action was followed up by a 5,000-word statement from the Japanese Government stating that the withdrawal was a protest against intervention by "any third party in the Manchurian problem."

Japanese Protest

Manchukuo was "founded by the spontaneous will of the people of Manchuria." It was impossible to apply "general formulae" to the situation; the "anti-foreign" character of the Chinese was stressed. (Chinese discussion insisted that anti-foreignism was aroused only against specific intervening elements.) Regional understandings were the true spirit of the League. Manchuria was freed from Chang Hsueh-liang's bandits, etc. Mr. Matsuoka appealed to the United States not to legalize the boycott.

Beginning with February 27, Great Britain was pro-

hibiting exports of munitions both to Japan and China. The regulation would stay in effect at least until there

Embargoes

was time to determine the attitude of other countries. The announcement of this decision by Sir John Simon, Foreign Secretary, caused astonishment. Later comment inclined to the view, despite Japan's protests against the embargo as unfair, that it really favored Japan, owing to the latter's greater store of arms. There were also considerable qualifications allowing fulfilment of present contracts. American Congressional opinion remained unfavorable to the embargo idea.

The authorization of a consultative committee of twenty-one, on the Manchurian situation, was announced by the League on February 23. The committee would be

Committee of Twenty-One

formed by the existing Committee of Nineteen with the addition of Holland and Canada, as signers of the Nine Power treaty. The United States and Soviet Russia would be asked to cooperate. A copy of the Assembly's report was sent to Secretary Stimson of the United States, with the explanation that as only one of the two parties, China, had accepted the report, adherence thereto could not, under its terms, be asked as yet.

In his report as chairman of the committee of three on Latin American conflicts, Sean Lester, of the Irish Free State, made known on March 1 that the League had

Plan for Leticia

formally proposed that an international army under the authority of a League commissioner should hold the Leticia territory in the Upper Amazon region pending negotiations between Colombia and Peru. The United States Government had given this proposal its fullest support, urging both countries to support it. Colombia had accepted it without reservation and Peru had asked for a few more days in which to study it. It was also recommended that the committee should start drafting a report at once. The question of an arms embargo against Bolivia and Paraguay was being secretly discussed by the Council.

Alfred Noyes, than whom no greater English poet lives, will contribute to our next issue a discerning paper on the novels of the late Mrs. Wilfrid Ward.

Einstein and Galileo! In many ways they are alike. Yet, they differ much, and the ages in which they lived are ages apart. Walter J. Miller writes of them in a brilliant comparative study.

Much is now heard of barter and scrip, a system through which we may disdain money, really. Floyd Anderson offers the facts to date in his "Depression Economics: Barter and Scrip."

Francis Talbot seems to be worried about the honesty of some of the great titans of criticism. His title reads: "What Fools These Critics. . ."

A trifle savage, perhaps, is Jerome Blake's attack on the Prominent Catholic Layman in "An Inarticulate Layman." But then, perhaps, gentle savagery is needed.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1933

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
GERARD B. DONNELLY

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN
Associate Editors

JOHN LAFARGE
JAMES F. DONOVAN

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: MEDallion 3-3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Bankers and Brigands

IN the spirit of an ancient jape, it may be said that the difference between the bankers before the Senate investigation committee, and the famous bandit, Jesse James, is that Jesse used a horse. But that is not the chief difference. Jesse did not prey on widows and orphans. He did not sell them an article for a dollar, claiming that it was really worth two dollars, when he knew that it was worth, on a liberal estimate, about six cents. Jesse had some sense of honor and fair dealing. The bankers, of whom some are now under indictment, lacked that sense entirely.

For a number of years the management of a number of American banks, engaged in the practice of selling bond issues, either directly or through affiliates, has been scandalously lax. As the *New York Times* remarks editorially, even apart from the scandals which have piled up within the last few years, the banking system of the United States is notoriously defective. Between 1920 and 1932, according to figures published in the *New York Evening Post*, nearly 10,000 American banks failed. Both Federal and State legislation is at fault. Charters are granted with little or no investigation, provided that the absolute necessities required by law are somehow met. Incompetent and, as the events of the last few years have shown, thoroughly dishonest men have been permitted to act as presidents and directors.

These men have turned their backs upon the principles of sound banking, to go into speculative fields, and what they gambled with was not so much their own money, as the money entrusted to them by the public. It is admitted that frequently the line between a productive and a speculative purpose is not easily drawn; like other men, bank officials can make honest mistakes. It is not these exceptional cases which the Senate has uncovered, but cases of plain indifference to the interests of the public.

If a bank must make a business of selling securities, State or industrial, is it too much to ask that the public which is importuned to buy be told in plain language on what these securities rest? That would seem only fair,

yet one bank official informed the Senate that, in his judgment, those were details which would hardly interest the public. That official's bank had used "high-pressure" salesmanship to sell a foreign loan, although reports made by the bank's own investigators showed the loan to be highly speculative. The country in question had a deplorable financial record, a backward population, and an unstable Government, yet the bank managed to sell millions at ninety-six and over. No interest has been paid for some years, and the present value of the bonds is about six.

This is not an isolated instance, nor is it the worst. Thousands of people all over the country have lost the last penny of their savings, reserved for their support in old age, because of bankers who used their opportunities and position in the community to engineer "wild-cat" loans. Four years ago, when the failure of banks wrought havoc, particularly in the South, this Review protested the all but general disregard of sound banking principles and practices. Little or nothing has been done to remedy the evil. The Glass banking bill makes a good beginning, but only a beginning, and is itself open to serious objections. Will the disclosures of the Norbeck Committee take our banks back to common sense and to common honesty?

The Slave Wage

IT is highly important, during the period through which we are passing, to conserve the gains which labor, organized and unorganized, has won during the past fifty years. Among the most important of these is the right of labor to a living wage.

Within the last year, it has become apparent that some devices, apparently devised to check unemployment, have had the effect of erasing from the minds of employers all concept of the living wage. Many employers have been eager to take advantage of "the glutted market in labor," by paying mere pittance to their employes. Others, feeling that the retention of a decent wage would make competition impossible for them, have adopted the same evil policy.

According to a report made by the Consumers League of New York, women are working at skilled, or semi-skilled, labor for as little as \$4.00 for a forty-eight hour week. For lining seventy-two pairs of slippers, women workers receive twenty-one cents. In order to earn \$1.05 per day, the workers must handle 720 pairs of slippers in a nine-hour day, or one every forty-five seconds. The worker fortunate enough to be employed for a forty-five hour week would thus receive a weekly wage of \$5.25. Nor are these instances isolated. A survey of all types of women clerical workers and assistants shows wages ranging from \$4.00 to \$10.32 per week.

The League believes that the only answer to this barbarity is minimum-wage legislation. The employer who wishes to pay a living wage is helpless, when his competitors can cut the production costs by paying slave wages. In his message of February 27 to the State Assembly, Governor Lehman took the same stand. Women and children are being exploited by brutal employers,

wrote the Governor, and he feared that the practice was spreading. With full knowledge of the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States had declared certain forms of minimum-wage legislation unconstitutional, the Governor recommended the Assembly to enact a State minimum-wage law.

It is interesting to observe that Governor Lehman believes it may be possible for the States to settle this problem among themselves. The power of Congress here is small in scope, and can apply, if at all, only to industries which supply commodities for inter-State shipments. The powers of the several States are larger, and Governor Lehman believes that the smaller States would follow the lead of the great manufacturing States. In our judgment, State minimum-wage legislation is both feasible and necessary. Governor Lehman is to be congratulated on his courage in stating the problem with clarity and force.

The Newest Amendment

EVERY fresh discussion of the Amendment in repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment seems to start new difficulties. Lawyers are at odds on the precise meaning of some of its terms, and even authorities on the Constitution are unable to agree on a definition of "convention." James M. Beck, whose writings on the Constitution are well and favorably known, holds that the convention is a State body. A. Mitchell Palmer, former Attorney General of the United States, who has studied the matter with care, holds that a convention, in the sense of the proposed Amendment, is a Federal body. To satisfy all claimants, a group of distinguished lawyers in New York drew up a document in which they asserted that the convention was partly a State, but mainly a Federal, body!

The second section, forbidding the importation of alcoholic beverages into States which have banned them, also raises some interesting questions. Thus a correspondent writes to ask if it will not prohibit the importation of wine for the Holy Sacrifice into "dry" States. "The language," he writes "is innocent, but will the application be equally innocuous?"

Certainly the purpose of this section is to keep alcoholic beverages out of States which have forbidden them, and to enforce this prohibition by Federal authority. Should any "dry" State decide that the importation of wine for the Holy Sacrifice is contrary to its ideals of temperance, the Federal Government would not only be empowered, but required, to stop all shipments into that State. Catholics would then be obliged to show that such legislation was an invasion upon personal liberty and natural rights which conflicted with the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. Until the case was decided, they would be obliged, as far as the newest Amendment is in question, to refrain from importing altar wine. That they would so refrain is, of course, unthinkable.

It is perfectly clear, however, that the proposed Amendment does not take from the Federal Government all control of the liquor traffic. On the contrary, it obliges the Government to stand guard at the gates of any State which enacts Prohibition legislation. The present direc-

tor of the Federal Prohibition Bureau is quite right when he says that a Prohibition Bureau of some sort, either the present type, or another, is as necessary as ever. Its extent will be limited or enlarged as the States enact, or decline to enact, local Prohibition legislation. The chief vice of the old Amendment, Federal control, is retained in principle, but subject to limitation. Nor do we think that the Amendment will succeed in "taking the saloon out of Federal politics." In our view, it keeps the saloon and the speakeasies as well, in Federal politics, for the simple reason that it necessitates a Federal machinery for enforcement.

We will solve many problems, but not all, by repealing the Eighteenth Amendment. Perhaps we are capacious and hard to please, but it seems to us that while the newest Amendment is an improvement on the Eighteenth Amendment, it actually establishes governmental evils which a more honest and straightforward repeal would have destroyed. Millions of citizens who have no interest whatever in beer or whiskey, are deeply interested in keeping the Federal Government out of activities and agencies which do not in the least concern it. The newest Amendment does not do that.

False Education

THE pundits and the mahdis of the tax-supported school system held a busy session in Minneapolis two weeks ago, under the auspices of the National Education Association. As far as can be gathered from the published reports, their sole purpose was to impress the public with the alleged fact that "it is the worst sort of economy" to ask the public school authorities to economize, even for the duration of this economic depression.

Among the leaders of the movement was Dr. George D. Strayer, of Columbia University. Dr. Strayer held out for the retention of music, art, and home economics, on an undiminished scale. Reading, writing, and arithmetic were important, he conceded, but music, along with art and home economics, is "fundamental to our social well being." Higher in importance are history, economics, and government, since they furnish our young people with "the only sound basis for meeting the problems which they must confront when they take over the management of society." If we deny the public schools at this time, argued Dr. Strayer, "we must provide more space in jails and penitentiaries."

This is venerable patter, familiar to all who have followed the campaign which has raised the cost of the public schools fivefold in fifteen years. But never did patter sound more hollow. Today the world is not calling for men and women who have studied art and music and home economics. It is not even greatly interested in men and women who have steeped themselves in history, economics, and government. But from every field of human endeavor, from the administration of country towns to the control of international relations, the cry goes up for men and women who know their religion, and live it.

That generation will never be given the world by a system of education which eliminates God. The tax-sup-

ported schools have been sustained at the expense of the public for well nigh a century, and no one can say that this support has been grudging. The result is a race of men and women who if they believe that God exists, neither honor nor obey Him, and a country in which lawlessness, crime, and disrespect for legitimate authority flourish as in no other country under the sun.

Mere secular knowledge, and the training that can be had through its acquisition, cannot give "the only sound basis" on which the problems of society are to be solved. As our fathers held, before this detestable secularism in education invaded the country, that basis can be supplied only by religion and morality.

A Dent in the Brown Derby

FOR many years, Alfred E. Smith has been known to the whole country not only as an able politician but also as that far rarer creature, an honest politician. That fact alone lends importance to the argument which he laid before the Senate Finance Committee, urging the recognition of the Soviet Government by the United States. On further reflection, Mr. Smith may temper his argument, which he seems to have offered in a somewhat careless and off-hand manner, by a few important reservations and distinctions. At present, however, the case looks very much like a dent in that famous brown derby which Mr. Smith has worn with singular distinction for more than a decade.

As reported by the New York *Evening Post*, Mr. Smith began his argument with the statement that he knew no reason why we should not take the Soviet to our official bosom. Senator King, of Utah, promptly supplied him with an excellent reason, namely, that prior to recognition the Soviet must dissociate itself completely from the Third International, and from its hostile propaganda against this and other governments.

Mr. Smith passed the argument by with a scornful wave of the brown derby. Communism, he stoutly asserted, was making no headway, not even in New York where, if anywhere, its plots and stratagems would be felt. "Crackpots" and other agitators had been getting up on soap boxes on the East Side, and elsewhere, ever since he was a boy, but in spite of that, "people in New York are suffering in patience."

As need hardly be noted, Mr. Smith did not answer Senator King's argument. He did not even understand it. At least, it is to be hoped that he did not understand it, for his own argument seems to rest on a principle entirely foreign to his humane and generous spirit. He would recognize the Soviet on the sole and sufficient ground that recognition would be good for business.

Now it might be pointed out, and with complete relevance too, that the Soviet Government is pledged to attack and, if possible, to destroy Christianity, and all institutions for which Christianity distinctly stands. The evidence for this statement is found in the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, adopted in December, 1923, in the programs of the Third International, with which the Soviet is identified, and in the

overt acts of the Soviet since that time. Put in other words, as Father La Farge wrote in these pages some weeks ago, "it is pledged to destroy that Divine Faith which we not only hold sacred, but recognize as the only basis on which society can be restored."

Recognition of a Government of that type will certainly not be "good for business," unless by the term we mean that business which is conducted in defiance of the Divine and the natural laws. Nor will such recognition add to the peace of Europe or to the stabilization of world peace. The first effect will be to imperil stable government in the countries bordering on Russia, and strengthen the hands of Communistic propagandists now at work here and in every capital on the Continent. Recognition by the United States will mean that this country of political and religious freedom enters into friendly relations with a Government determined to destroy all Christian institutions and with them, necessarily, the home, the altar, and the State. We may be in a desperate financial condition, and we are. But God forbid that we seek to better our condition by entering into friendly relations with thieves and murderers, and with politicians who profane all that we hold most sacred.

It is wholly relevant to consider these facts in connection with the proposed recognition. But the case may also be considered on strictly legalistic grounds. It has been our tradition to grant or withhold recognition of foreign countries on two conditions; first, has the nation a stable existence; and, second, can it and will it fulfill its international obligations. That the first condition is verified in the Soviet may, possibly, be conceded, but not the second. What Secretary of State Stimson wrote more than two years ago remains true today. We cannot recognize the Soviet until it "ceases agitating for the overthrow by force of the Government of the United States."

Mr. Smith began by stating that he knew no reason why we should not recognize the Soviet Government. What his argument however, really proved was that he knew no reason why we should.

The Disappearing Classics

AT least twice a year, some distinguished educator arises to bewail the passing of the classics from our colleges. But he wails in vain.

The most recent abandonment of the classics was that of New York University, a huge institution conducted by a private corporation in the city of New York. Hitherto the college has demanded both Latin and Greek for the bachelor's degree in arts; hereafter, only one need be offered. The dean of the college trusts that this change will induce many students to aim at the degree in arts, instead of that in science.

It may be that the passing of the classics is inevitable. But on that supposition, why continue to grant a degree, without the classics, which for centuries has demanded the classics? When a man can be dubbed a bachelor of arts without Latin and Greek, we cannot be far from the time when his brother can be dubbed a bachelor of science without physics or mathematics.

Lent and God's Providence

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

AT the present time, we need, absolutely, desperately, the Providence of God. There is a great deal of talk current about our need of "confidence." But much of that talk, even though we do need confidence, springs from an uneasy consciousness that we cannot devise a world to operate by itself.

Not that we are to escape from our duty to use our brains, and find the remedy for the defects in the social order. Our system has been made by men, under God's Providence, and must be remedied by men, under God's Providence. We cannot sit still and expect the Creator to send us down, on a silver platter, a brand-new social order, with a Comte de Chambord to climb upon the throne and run it for us. Even the President cannot do that; much less the forty-eight Governors.

But taking into account everything that God expects us to use our brains to find out, everything that the National Federation of Catholic Alumni, or Michael O'Shaughnessy and his Christocrats, are studying over, and all the lessons that the Catholic Industrial Conference flung upon the critical air of the Hotel Astor, we still know that none of it will work unless God provides. Otherwise, the painfully reactionary words that the priest utters when he places the ashes upon your brow of an Ash Wednesday will take on a still more painful meaning: "Remember, man, that thou art dust, and unto dust thou shalt return."

God helps directly, by providing us with what we need, abundantly, unexpectedly, in a charming and original way. It may be a very little thing (for instance, that He provided me at Christmas, through the kind intervention of my Rev. Superior, with a fountain pen which actually writes), or it may be that He averts a world disaster through a little woman's courage, as He did the other day at Miami.

Then His Providence helps indirectly, by giving to human beings that confidence in one another which they need, in order to transact business, and keep themselves from cutting one another's throats.

But how to make God provide? As is well known, the good Lord has no higher-up; and is not susceptible either to flattery or to bribery.

The answer, as in the case even of human personages, is to appeal to His friends. For instance, there was the famous Don Cottolengo, who founded the *Piccola Casa*, the "Little House," at Turin. This institution shelters some 8,000 persons who, either from youth or from misfortune, need special protection and care: the sick, afflicted in mind and body, orphans, and so on. It is a very large house; but is called "little," I suppose, by that peculiar logic to which holy people have the key, that sees all things as little in comparison with God, upon whom all things wholly depend.

Don Cottolengo was one of the most tremendous believers in Divine Providence that the world has ever seen.

The "Little House" has never accepted any funds. It keeps no books, I am informed; makes no account of its yearly budget; but simply takes in today the alms which it pays out tomorrow.

Father C. M. de Heredia, S.J., who is one of those dreadful Spanish Mexicans, whom the Seminars traveling to Mexico (meals, but not laundry, included) appear always to be hoping that Dewey-trained Americans will not notice: the kind that the Indians are supposed to forget if they are to make good models for Diego de Rivera—anyhow, Father de Heredia once upon a time went to see Don Cottolengo, and the good man showed him a bill for 2,000 lire which a creditor was clamoring for. In those days, a lira was a lira, and not just four cents. And there was no money in the Little House; nor ever was. So Don Cottolengo settled the affair as he always did: went to the chapel, taking his Mexican friend with him, held up his hands to the tabernacle, with the palms out-stretched, in the style of the poor fellows who lined the roadside, and called to the Son of David to have mercy on them, then quietly took a stroll around the buildings. When they came back, the mail had come in. He invited Father de Heredia to open it, and the unsolicited gifts rolled out. For Don Cottolengo had no mailing list, no agents, no rubber-stamped appeal, and sold no indulgenced rosaries or crucifixes. There was enough to pay the bill and over; and both the Lord and the Don, as well as Father de Heredia, called it a day.

Now Don Cottolengo had a philosophy, which was the key to the situation. To run the Little House he needed extraordinary Divine favors, not just an occasional good turn or so. The good Lord had to be helping him morning, noon, and night, and in the most tangible form. To take Francis P. Garvan's idea, the Lord had to do arithmetic, and religion and arithmetic were inextricably bound. But, said this holy man, to obtain *extraordinary* favors you need *extraordinary* confidence. Just have a great confidence, and the great manifestation of Providence will come as a matter of course. Small confidence, small favors. Mighty confidence, mighty favors. God will match us every time.

But how obtain this mighty confidence? By self-persuasion? Easy; but delusive. God looks for deeds, not for psychological states. For some light on this second phase of our problem, we may turn to another friend of God, the late Msgr. Seipel, the former Chancellor of the Austrian Republic. Dr. Seipel, too, wanted extraordinary favors from God. The time that Father Tierney visited him, in Vienna, and gave him the good word that saved Seipel from Gethsemani and Austria from collapse, he was looking for Divine Providence to provide for a whole nation; and, what is more difficult, to give him the brains to do his part therein. Seipel, like Don Cottolengo, asked much from God; and like that apostle of charity, he asked, too, great self-sacrifice from his fellow man; only not

from just a few chosen workers, but from his 1,700,000 fellow-citizens and from all the great nations of the world. How did he get it? By denying himself.

Seipel died a poor man. He left nothing after him but his scant wardrobe and his books. He kept account each day of even the tiniest expenditures, so that not a penny should be lost that he might somehow save or spend for the poor. Cottolengo's no-bookkeeping; Seipel's hourly bookkeeping—yet both the same idea.

As ex-chancellor, he lived in a little room provided by the Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo, worked on a plain pine table without a drawer, and had so little laundry for the washerwoman that she was amazed. He could not afford to purchase a new overcoat, to supply the old shabby one that he wore.

Seipel's basic idea was the goodness of God; and the goodness of men. "God is good; everything will work out well, for God is so good." All men were trusted or excused. When the crazed Jaworek tried to assassinate him, Seipel remarked: "Don't strike!" When a workman jumped on the running-board of his car, on July 15, 1927, and threatened his life, Seipel whispered to him: "Go on down, so that you won't get into trouble!" In his controversial messages with his bitterest adversaries, he slipped in the words *Cordial greetings* over his official signature.

Self-denial; generosity to the poor; goodness to enemies: these were Seipel's technique with God. That technique is infallible. "God will be liberal with us," said one of His friends, "in proportion as we are liberal with Him."

All of which brings me to what I principally had in mind. Lent began on March 1. Now Lent is not *just* a time for expiating our sins. It is also a time when great favors of Divine Providence are also granted to the suffering world. It is the time for appealing to the most hidden places of the Divine mercy. This year it is the prelude to the opening of the Holy Year, which our Pontiff has set aside particularly that God's Providence may be lavished on both the material and the spiritual needs of men.

Lent, likewise, has its technique. And it is the same as that of Cottolengo and Seipel. It is a period of extraordinary confidence in God, shown by self-denial; almsgiving; and reviving—through self-purification, the Sacraments, and the hearing of the word of God—our own goodness of heart.

The almsgiving and spiritual renewal, though really the most difficult element, seem to us lazy moderns easy in comparison with the first, or purely penitential part of Lent. Indeed, we are drifting into a vague assumption that somehow Lenten fasts are a thing of the past. As a contemporary moralist observes, the only people who seem to be generally considered as falling under the law of fasting are the idle rich; and they are apt to be excused, on the ground of nervous complaints, or because they are everlastingly traveling about.

Why is it that the Church has so relaxed and modified her fasting discipline through the centuries? Just so as

to make things more pleasant for us here below, like the kind mothers who provide their infants with pennies to go to the movies? The Church has no such idea; one generation needs penance as much as another, and none have needed it more than that of today. What is wanted is not that a few should somehow comply with the law, but that some form of penance, even though it be mild, should be widely diffused, practically general, among all kinds and conditions of men. There should be no "Lenters and non-Lenters"; but Lent for all.

If we scrutinize anew our familiar Lenten regulations, we may find that we can observe them with less serious inconvenience than we believe. After all, the standard daily menu of the American business man or woman approximates pretty closely to the requirements of the present-day Lenten discipline. Breakfast has become light, and is practically the same as the "morsel" allowed, particularly if, at some time, we should be permitted to substitute a simple breakfast cereal for bread. The business lunch is close to the collation, indeed usually well within the limits. And the main meal, the dinner, in the evening, remains as it has always been. Certain moralists would have us estimate the fasting requirements of the Church less in absolute measurements or ounces and more in relation to the normal schedule of meals; thus making the approximation easier to the frugality that ordinary worldly prudence enjoins.

Good faith, then, in observing the fasts of the Church, in studying how they may be carried out by as large a proportion of the Faithful as possible, is a standard and simple way of showing our confidence in God; and thus of winning extraordinary favors from His Providence. If we confide in God, we shall confide in one another; and a great wound of our present order of things will be healed. The Lent of 1933 should be not only a great expiation, but a great remedy as well.

Puritanisms in Greater Boston

GEORGE T. EBERLE, S.J.

MY story begins with a chopping tray. The chopping tray was a deep wooden platter used by housewives for compounding hash. The chopping tray is not mentioned as an antique, nor even as a reality; for to some of us it has faded into a symbol, a symbol of our early New England environment. We grew up to the music of the chopping tray. Like the precise and efficient schoolma'am of those days in her classroom, the Yankee believed in frequent repetitions in his dining room, and with an iron regularity a review of the week graced his board in the form of hash. Today the word *hash* has become obsolescent in the New England kitchen, and other words borrowed from languages spoken in far-off lands have replaced it on the menu. But the word *hash* and the kindred word *hatchet* have the old Norman flavor. They came to England with the Conquest and to America on the Mayflower.

At least once a week an old aunt of mine, who was no Yankee although in a long lifetime she had absorbed many

Puritanisms, used to remark: "Hark, hash again next door. Listen to Dame Trott at her chopping tray." (You may say it was horrible of my aunt. In devotion I would rush to her defense. But, alas, like the grandmamma of the New England poet, "Poor old lady, she is dead long ago." Besides, like Massachusetts, she needs no defense.) There she stands, to my mind's eye, in her big, airy kitchen laughing merrily. The remark implies in her neither weakness of will in a moral sense, nor weakness of wit in any sense, unless one were to say that her strong Irish wit amounted to a Celtic weakness.

Though they knew it not, the coming of the Irish to New England was a blessing in disguise to the Puritans, for they supplied just the things the Puritans lacked: lightness of heart, friendliness, the open hand of generosity, and, above all, a Catholic sense of humor. These two different peoples, living side by side, with at first but little in common, and with great natural antipathies, were destined gradually by a better understanding and appreciation to be brought closer together, until they exercised each upon the other a profound influence.

But to return to my aunt. How, I ask you, could she resist the nickname "Dame Trott" which mimicked so faithfully the rapid clatter of hash making? Besides, the epithet served another purpose. It rounded out and softened the stern portrait of the grim housewife next door by recalling to us that, like the lady of the nursery rhyme, "she fed her cat on the sweetest of milk."

Yankee fare was frugal, with no waste and hash aplenty. Of course, the swine maintained by the city fathers got scant nourishment. But what the Yankee saved by the chopping tray he put on his back, and when he appeared with his family, silent and somber, on Sunday morning to go to meeting, all were clad in goodly raiment. Respectability was a stern law of the Puritan code. Although he abhorred ritualism, goodly garments amounted to a rite in his religion. A Catholic of those days, obeying a precept of his Church, might slip in unnoticed and unremarked to early Mass in a shiny coat, but not so the Puritan going to meeting. For him such a thing was unthinkable, indecent. Attending service was not essential, but clothes were. The English butler described by Dickens fairly radiated respectability. In like manner, the garb of our Yankee neighbors must betoken respectability and must simulate, when it did not actually denote, prosperity. He might in human frailty fall from righteousness and violate a precept of the Mosaic Decalogue, but this rite of religion never. It was a tradition grown into a dogma. Amid many changing customs it still endures.

The sermon was the center of his worship. This had a profound effect upon the preacher. He was all or he was nothing. He was popular and influential or he was ignored, and there was always the temptation to be popular at any cost. How easy then, knowing his audience, to appeal to their passions, to arouse them to anger or hatred or to a spirit of intolerance. This sometimes happened, and will happen as long as the sermon usurps the rightful place of sacrifice in worship and the preacher faces the temptation to bid for popularity.

Puritan traits and virtues are commonly associated with the Old Testament. He was thrifty and frugal, he was honest and God fearing, and above all, he was righteous. In morality he was a rigorist and could never learn to distinguish between use and abuse. The don'ts of the Decalogue were not sufficient for him. He must fulminate new prohibitions, not based on reason or the law of nature, but upon his flair for fanaticism. "Thou shalt not dance or gamble." "Thou shalt not play ball upon the Sabbath." "Thou shalt not ferment." The Puritan looked down upon his Catholic neighbors. Hilaire Belloc explains this as a heritage of his early Calvinism. His ancestors, as a defense mechanism to avoid despair, had to believe that they were among the Elect and as some one has to be reckoned among the goats, well, the Irish immigrant conveniently became the goat.

In matters of art, when the Puritan began to go in for beauty, he began timidly with subdued colors and severe lines. But happily, the influence of the countrymen of Michelangelo has been felt, and dwellings and temples as plain as barns are discovered only by the antiquarian.

The matter of pronunciation, so important in Greater Boston, must not be passed over in silence. Can you not still recall the awful reserve of the girl from Beacon Hill with the broadest "A" of them all, who called it "vase"? The pronunciation known as Bostonese is a trio in which the east wind, the Celtic brogue, and the Yankee twang sing together. One "not to the manner born" is apt to mistake the unadulterated nasal twang of the hinterlands of Northampton for Bostonese. But the nasality of Boston is much milder, and might be described as containing less acidity, just as new cider differs from hard cider. A scion of New England in an irreverent moment once remarked that life there was one long struggle to shake the clothespin from one's nose.

Perhaps this Celto-Puritanism of the Yankee brogue may be best described for the outsider by a fable, which is more than a fable, being mostly a fact. Once upon a time the patricians of Back Bay sallied forth amid the ringing of church bells to argue with the plebeians of South Boston. "Their cause was righteous," they said, "because it was openly boasted in South Boston that the Irish brogue was sweeter than the Yankee twang." The two parties met by agreement at St. Patrick's bridge, and after proper preliminaries, the debate was on. As argument waxed hot, there floated over the salt marshes the rich rasp of the brogue mingled with the bow-string twang of Yankee retort. Day after day the battle was renewed until, lo, another Babel of tongues occurred and the controversy came to an abrupt end. The Back Bay went home with a bit of the brogue and South Boston kept some of the twang. And so it remains even to this day.

The raw east wind still blows upon a sturdy people in Greater Boston. This is strikingly evidenced by the fact that its last remaining cottage industry is the raising of star athletes who are annually shipped in coach loads to all colleges east of the Rockies. Unhappily other races are fast destroying this industry by mass production.

The Celt, while strongly influenced externally by his

environment, has clung steadfastly to the spiritual and cultural ideals he brought with him three generations ago from the Emerald Isle. Of course, a small minority turned apes and social climbers, but like the Eurasians of Kow Loon near Hong Kong, they form a caste apart, and are justly snubbed and ignored by all.

To those who have been so indulgent as to read thus far, the writer ends with a blunt but interesting question: "How far has Puritanism affected the author?"

His sense of shock as he realizes the significance of this question is curiously enough suggested by a ditty which appeared in the *Boston Transcript*:

O see the happy moron,
He doesn't give a damn;
I wish I were a moron:
My God, perhaps I am!

And so, am I a Puritan? Shades of the Vaterland and Ireland!

The Decay of Party Loyalty

EDMUND BOOTH YOUNG

IT is a fact undeniably evident that in the last few years unflinching attachment to a political party has become less and less certain and not so surely to be counted upon. Not with so much assurance can the leaders of a party today reckon up, before they are cast, the votes of those who have registered as belonging to the particular party. Moreover, there are heard now more and more open avowals of political independence. We all remember the shift of the Southern Democrats in 1928, and, if it had bigotry as its base, it was, nevertheless, an act of secession. So also today there are indications of the lapse of many, because of the depression, from the Republican party to the Democrats and of some to the Socialists. The new Cabinet contains at least two former Republicans.

The old campaign oratory does not create the spell it once did and there is a disposition to scoff at pre-election party promises. Now, whether this weakening of party ties—or, shall we say, decay of party loyalty?—is to be regarded as genuinely an emancipation or as something to cause deep regret is another matter. The fact remains, and what is to be done about it? It would seem to be a matter of practical politics.

Just as party alignment is taken lightly, so it seems to be the belief that there is no essential difference between the old parties and that what difference exists is only that between the "ins" and the "outs." No doubt this is deplorable heresy to both of them. Of course, the Republicans and the Democrats have divergent tariff creeds inherited from the days of the Fathers, but perhaps both parties have grown modernistic. Whether or not there are other really distinctive characteristics possessed by each, as the elephant and the donkey have dissimilarities, at any rate very many voters have not been instructed as to what they are or have not understood.

There really would seem to be discernible (and this they who cavil do not seem to get) a less material form of difference which arises out of inheritance, racial traits, and type of mind. There is a Democratic slant and a Republican slant. This subtle difference between a life-long Democrat and a dyed-in-the-wool Republican, while hard to define, is a reality, so I think. The Republican is conscious that his party has a peculiar genius for government, and the Democrat thinks there is something Jeffersonian of which he is the custodian or, at least, such used

to be the case. Whether this is fact or moonshine, it is not something which is compelling as are clearly defined and accepted political principles. The practical matter is that, if these political principles are not clearly seen by our sovereign citizens, what is to be the cement to bind the faithful together?

In times of depression, such as we have been passing through, the voice of the Socialist and the Communist becomes more insistent in the land. When in times of prosperity, the dinner pail being full, this voice is but a still small voice; in times that are hard it is tremendously amplified. The solo of the soap box becomes the chorus of pulpits and platforms and college halls.

The added volume comes from those Democrats and Republicans who have been made to believe (if only for a while) that the difference between the two great parties is in truth a distinction between tweedledum and tweedledee. The Socialists, profiting by the opportunity afforded by lean years, not only make this charge, but also represent the parties in question as both basically conservative and evilly capitalistic by instinct. They say that it is not impossible for the predatory to be either Republicans or Democrats and yet walk in the house of Mammon as friends—to be in cahoots while the workers endure a state of want which neither party seems disposed seriously to remedy. Is their statement to be dismissed as unworthy of consideration, or is it to be considered and met? Socialism, so they say, is a protest movement against what is the economic inadequacy of both parties.

In aid of the Socialists we have many clerical and professorial advocates. As never before, the ministers of churches and college professors are preaching and teaching that there must be established a new economic order. Religious papers are sowing the seed of the gospel of a new era.

This being the case, it is worth noticing that there are many organizations, originally (but now less definitely) religious which are becoming more and more useful to the Socialist cause. The machinery is set up. It is not inconceivable that in the future, when there will be even a less strongly sounded dogmatic note, these units having to function somehow or die will become more or less locals in the cause of Socialism—perhaps called "social service"—and thus become definitely political. It may chance that local churches, county, State, and national denominational

groups will help in the final overthrow of the present order under which Republicans and Democrats are accustomed to carry on. And the colleges, even though sustained by capitalistically furnished endowments, offer a pulpit for the propagandist of the same reform.

State ownership of basic industries, collectivism as against individualism, the denial of the individual's right to own land, and, in general, the ideal of the all-controlling State are some of the ideas which neither Republican, nor Democratic—nor for that matter American—will edge the old parties off the platform if the said ideas are not countered.

Any thinking and observing man is well aware that in the present order there are many and great abuses and that there is much to correct. To admit that capitalism has its defects and that within it is the possibility of fraud and oppression is not to say that the abuses are necessary and irremediable. It is only the interested theorist who can allege that it is radically wrong. Both parties are charged with being capitalistic, and the charge cannot be denied if one understands by capitalism the right to engage in business for gain, the right to put savings out at interest, and the right of individual initiative unhampered by some commissar. Both the Democrats and the

Republicans have without question accepted these rights and have sought to maintain them, expounding the doctrine of individual liberty as against a too-paternal State.

If the two traditional parties are to maintain themselves in these days of testing and reexamination, they will have to influence the people by their fair performance. They must reconsecrate themselves from time to time to the cause of honesty and efficiency and keep their houses in order. There is not the passive obedience there once was and loyalty must be paid for in the coin of good behavior.

The aim must be to secure for office men of real character and ability rather than those who have no other qualification than that they want a job. Political "deals" will have to be not so offensive. Real service rather than mere job holding will have to be the accomplishment. Graft will have to be less conspicuous in public life and respect for law, justice, and efficiency will have to be more conspicuous or else a change will come. If it shall not become more evident that the Democratic and Republican parties are determined upon good, clean, and able government (differing only in the matter of methods), the not-impossible outcome, with people sitting so lightly in the party pew, may be a one-party Socialist State. Personally, I would not have it so.

The Pope and the Corporations

GERARD B. DONNELLY, S.J.

CATHOLICS have a particular reason, I believe, for welcoming the recent book by Adolph A. Berle, Jr., and Gardiner C. Means, of Columbia University. "The Modern Corporation and Private Property," with its thesis that private ownership is being strangled in this country by the growth and workings of the corporate system, has already received high praise as an epoch-making volume. Catholics, however, will find an additional reason for interest. The book might justly be called a laboratory manual or companion piece to certain parts of Pope Pius' "Quadragesimo Anno."

A difficulty about the Encyclical—at least in the mind of the general reader—is that it does not enter into a detailed discussion of the economic facts which it presents. The Pope has given the world a masterly analysis of its troubles, but he does not set down the facts which form the basis of his conclusions. There are no graphs, charts, or tables of statistics in the Encyclical. It was the Holy Father's intention to diagnose the ills of modern society. This he has done brilliantly. Nevertheless, he has seen fit to state his findings succinctly, without attempting to illustrate them with particular examples or cases in point.

As a result, the ordinary reader frequently fails to see either the truth or the bearing of certain passages. Some of the most important sentences in the Encyclical, illuminating as they are to economists, sound—at least to the careless or hasty reader—like mere casual remarks or unimportant generalities. Hence they are likely to leave him unimpressed or without a clear comprehension of what the Pope means. This new volume by the Colum-

bia professors will serve as a sort of commentary on some passages, explaining or proving them with concrete examples. I propose here to select a single sentence from the Encyclical and to illustrate it with some of the facts set forth by Berle and Means.

In the third part of "Quadragesimo Anno" the Pope begins his diagnosis of our troubled world:

It is patent that in our days not alone is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic domination are concentrated in the hands of a few, and that these few are not the owners but only the trustees and directors of invested funds. . . .

There is an example of what I spoke of—a profound observation which may easily fail to impress the general reader because it is brief and summary in language and not clarified by examples. In fact, one is almost tempted at first to doubt the truth of the statement. How can the Pope claim that wealth is accumulated in the hands of only a few men? As far as this country is concerned we know that the number of Americans holding shares in corporate enterprises is staggering. A rough estimate, made in 1928, placed their total at 18,000,000. This is a diffusion, not a concentration of wealth—at least, of corporate wealth.

The answer is that the Pope is not referring to ownership but to control. It is the control of wealth that has been focused. The Pope is well aware of the fact that an immense number of people own shares of capital property; what he is stressing is the point that they have actually been deprived of power over it and that this power has been captured by a few dictators. One of the

most interesting phenomena of financial history is the modern divorce between the ownership of property rights and their control. It is a new situation, one peculiar to our own generation, and it means that the millions of investors in corporate enterprises have nothing whatever to say about what is to be done with their funds, this being the prerogative of the directors alone. The point that the Pope drives home—that these dictators are few and their power enormous—is something that can be realized only after some study of the various ways of acquiring and maintaining control of a corporation.

The first of these methods to concern us here is control by ownership of a majority of the stock. The one or two individuals who happen to possess fifty-one per cent of the voting stock in such a concern have obviously all the legal powers of a sole owner. They dominate the wealth, perhaps amounting to millions of dollars, of those who own the remaining forty-nine per cent. By the very nature of the case, however, this form of control is possible in only a few of the big corporations and in fact exists in only about five per cent of them; hence, it needs no further discussion.

Far more interesting are the methods by which a small group—often enough one or two men—may exercise an absolute tyranny over a giant corporation, even though they themselves own but a minute percentage of its capital stock. The Van Sweringen Brothers, for example, controlled eight Class-1 railroads having assets of \$2,000,000,000, although their own investment was less than \$2,000,000. Again, in 1928, Dillon, Read & Co., with a stake of less than two and a quarter millions, ruled the entire Dodge Brothers, Inc., a concern having assets of \$130,000,000, representing the investments of thousands of people. Or take the Cities Service Company and the Standard Gas & Electric. These were billion-dollar corporations, but for a time each was dictated to by a group owning only about a million dollars' worth of stock.

How were such miracles wrought? In each instance, it will be noted, the controllers' investment amounted to about one per cent of the capital. How was it possible for one or two men with so small an investment to govern gigantic corporations to which countless people had entrusted their funds?

The answer is that there are methods—methods which parallel the magic of the Arabian Nights. One such method, for instance, is the use of non-voting stock. Among the various kinds of securities issued, voting rights are deliberately confined to a small class. This was the technique employed by Dillon, Read. In the Dodge Brothers company neither the preferred stock nor four-fifths of the common had voting power. Only one-fifth was franchised. And of this fifth, Dillon, Read's block of 250,001 shares was a majority. By keeping control of the franchised fraction, they thus dominated the wealth of thousands of investors. Fox Film is another example of this.

A similar device consists in issuing excess-voting stock to the controlling group. Each share of this special class is given one full vote, while the shares of the second class

are allowed only a small fraction of a vote. In this way those who hold a block of privileged shares can outvote great numbers of those who own only the under-privileged securities. Thus when the Cities Service sold 1,000,000 full-vote shares to H. L. Doherty, he was enabled to exercise virtual control over a great group of voters whose stocks were enfranchised at only 1/20th of a vote per share. And in the Standard Gas & Electric the preferred at \$1.00 par value was endowed with voting power equal to the common at \$50. By a disproportionate investment in preferred, a few owners were thus able to dominate the affairs of a billion-dollar concern.

Pyramiding is another method, the one utilized by the Van Sweringens in the example given above. This device (with special reference to its use in dominating a whole group of operating companies) was fully explained in an article in this Review on October 29 which dealt with the wizardry and the collapse of Samuel Insull. Pyramiding was also the secret of that other fallen empire—Kreuger's. Owen D. Young has had some bitter things to say about it before the Norbeck Committee now investigating Wall Street.

There are additional artifices, such as the formation of voting trusts, perversions of the proxy system, and others which cannot be described here. All of them are devices for the legal and factual control over other people's money. Even from the examples given above the reader can get some idea of how it is possible for a small group to acquire and maintain control over vast wealth, and even of how they can extend this control to a second corporation and then a third, until in the end they exercise absolute dominion over sums that aggregate into an enormous total.

It is one thing, however, to state that a thing is possible and quite another to assert, even in the face of particular instances, that it is a fact. Is it a fact that power has been narrowed down to a few hands? Disregarding at this point any thought of possible methods, do we find that the Pope spoke the truth when he claimed that a financial oligarchy has been established? Statistics, at least those relative to this country, offer an impressive answer.

The corporate (non-banking) wealth of this nation amounted in 1930 to 165 billions of dollars. It appears that no less than 81 billions of this was controlled by the 200 largest corporations of the country. Anyway one takes it, that is a staggering figure. It means that a group comprising 42 railroads, 52 public utilities, and 106 industries, controls nearly half of the corporate wealth of the nation. Note that the figures refer to *direct* control. To what extent the big companies wield an indirect control will be realized only when one remembers that there exist hundreds of "smaller" corporations, many of them multi-million dollar concerns though not big enough for inclusion among the 200, and that in the very nature of things the fortunes of these concerns are intimately connected with the 200 leaders. Indirectly, therefore, the super-giants control more than half the country's corporate wealth. In fact they are widening their empire at

such a rapid rate that by 1950 they will directly own eighty-five per cent of our *national wealth*.

Who controls the super-giants themselves? When we get the answer to that query, we shall see the full force of the Pontiff's words. These 200 leading corporations are ruled by less than 2,000 men. In other words, half the corporate assets of the nation is subject to the super-giants, and the super-giants themselves are dominated by men whose names are so few that they could be listed in a single newspaper column. They are largely members of the big banks. When the reader recalls that this situation is paralleled to a large extent in Europe, he will comprehend the truth expressed by the Pope when he said that "wealth is accumulated, immense power and despotic domination are concentrated in the hands of a few."

Perhaps it would be well to repeat that these financial dictators do not own the great properties that they manage. In the Pope's words they are merely the "trustees and directors of invested funds," and the statistics show that in most instances their holdings in the corporations are surprisingly small.

In conclusion I quote the sentence with which Berle and Means summarize several chapters of their study of the corporation in America. It will be seen that their words are an echo of the Pope's. Their conclusions tally with his. More than that, if their summary be placed side by side with the passage of the Encyclical we have been discussing in this paper, it will be noticed that the two sentences ring with the same indignation. Read the Holy Father's words quoted above, and then hear them echoed in this passage from the American economists:

The concentration of economic power separate from ownership has in fact created economic empires and has delivered these empires into the hands of a new form of absolutism, relegating "owners" to the position of those who supply the means whereby the new princes may exercise their power.

The two passages form a forceful parallel.

Workers of the Land

HILAIRE BELLOC
(Copyright, 1933)

THING which strikes me most forcibly in the discussions of the present day, and especially when I read the gloomy forecasts of the future, is that the people who talk in this panicky way are leaving out about three-quarters of Christendom. They are leaving out the agricultural man working on his own land or on land on a long and safe lease, the man who works the soil—has worked it from generation to generation for centuries.

When I say that to leave him out is to leave out "three-quarters" of the population, I do not mean that it is three-quarters numerically, though I think it cannot be far short of that when you count in not only the man who actually works on the land but the local tradesmen and small distributors in little towns dependent upon him. I mean three-quarters in the opinion of Europe.

To read all this talk about the breakdown of Europe and the rest of it, one would think that this man living on the fields, as his fathers have done and as he intends his

sons to do after him, did not exist or was negligible. He is, on the contrary, the very stuff of Europe. He was there before these modern troubles began and will be there long after they have passed.

If men went about the world at a pace and in a fashion which brought them in touch with their fellow-beings and gave them a sense of reality, they would be awake to this difference. If they traveled about Europe on foot or on horseback they would see what a large, determining proportion of our people is the peasantry. But those who write about current affairs do not so travel. They either go by rail from one big town to another, or they move at top speed along the high roads and see nothing of the popular life—only a glimpse here and there, some place where they stop—and what they then see they ignore.

Apart from this inhuman way of traveling, which cuts off our writers of print from all real experience (they hardly ever know a family: they only know hotels), there is the fact that they themselves come from the great cities. The newspapers in which they give their pictures of the world also belong to the great cities. Therefore the tone of mind of the whole affair is that of the urban industrial population: the people dependent on a precarious wage which is all they have between themselves and disaster: the people pressed by the perpetual anxiety about rent for their mere shelter: the people who have lost all tradition, security, and citizenship. Our writers have so small experience of the other, older, and saner world outside of the cities, that for most of them it does not exist.

Of course, in this country, in England, it is worse than in other European States, for we are completely industrialized. Even the very small proportion of our people which still lives the life of countrymen gets its information and its ideas from the great towns: they are wage-earners, not peasants.

But we have a peasant State at our doors—Ireland. There are great peasant areas within a few miles of our shores, to the east and to the south. It is strange that we should have so little acquaintance with the weight carried by the free agricultural man in the total body of Europe!

Of course, this very large peasant proportion of Europe is suffering, like all the rest of the world, from the misfortunes of industrialism, but it is suffering in a different fashion and more tolerably than the great towns are suffering. It is suffering, but is nowhere near despair. The price of many of the peasant's products has sunk alarmingly in the last few years, but he can feed himself, has a roof over his head, and is nowhere taxed to breaking point as are the middle class, which does all the writing and sets the tone of the press.

Again, the burden of mortgages which held the peasant down before the War has been largely removed; for the crash of the currencies, which was an *almost* unmixed evil, had at least this good side to it, that it enabled the peasant to pay off his mortgages at a vastly reduced rate.

There is in peasant Europe today very little destitution and none of what is called in industrial conditions "unemployment"; for the man possessed of his farm employs himself and his family.

If that great bulk could get its experiences printed, what a different picture we should have of Europe from that which our newspapers give us!

Meanwhile, that great mass is pursuing a function which makes all the difference to the present state of affairs. It resists. What it is doing in Russia we do not know, for we are not told the truth about Russia and it is impossible to hear the truth about it. But in my judgment it matters little what happens to the tiller of the soil in Russia, for he is not, properly speaking, a part of Europe; his condition does not affect the mind of Europe. The cosmopolitan clique which has despotic power in Russia is the product of the most diseased of urban industrial minds. It may kill the Russian peasant or he may survive. Whether he survives or no, *our* Western peasantry will survive.

This great bulk of the peasantry resists. It resists the tendency to panic. It resists the mortal peril of insecurity. It is indifferent to the wide and disruptive forces of our time. It is almost untouched by the anarchic condition of our time. It continues.

My advice to anyone who wants to come to a sane judgment of what the future is likely to be is that he should for some two or three weeks abandon the towns and their newspapers and all that which colors every moment of life in England, and go afoot through some big stretch of agricultural Europe. Let him see the German peasantry of the Rhine and the Moselle valleys, the French and Italian peasantry, or the German population of the Middle and Upper Danube or the Tyrol. I think he will come back with quite a different conception of what the condition of Europe really is today from that with which he started.

With Scrip and Staff

SHOULD the PILGRIM define his terms? It is a modern privilege to dispense with this homely task; and the results are what we see them. In this respect, I am glad to be unmodern, and so reply cheerfully to the following communication, which (permitting myself some slight changes of patronymics), arrives from Felix J. Butler, of the Wildwood Oil Burner Corporation; and is addressed to our Rev. Editor:

Dear Sir,

Will you please ask THE PILGRIM to define for me the word "pretiosity" occurring on page 483 of your issue of February 18th? I cannot find it in my unabridged.

And I might second Mary Shaw's remark, "Have a heart," because the entire sentence in which this obscure word occurs is equally obscure to me.

Not that I want to express a preference, but it just strikes me as a pity that the ANCHORET's remarks had to be crowded out by sentences like that.

Very truly,
(signed, as it were) FELIX J. BUTLER.

To paragraph two, I reply that Mr. Butler's difficulty is just what I experienced with *Hound and Horn*, so that I am consoled by striking a sympathetic note.

With paragraph three, I agree sans reservation.

As to paragraph one, I find that a certain harking back to etymologies caused me to slip the obsolete *t* into the less obsolete form *preciosity*, concerning which the Standard Dictionary purveys the following:

Preciosity. *n.* 1. The quality or condition of being fastidious; extreme delicacy; overniceness, especially as affected by the French *précieuses* of the 17th century.

"Mr. [Thomas] Hardy . . . is too apt to affect a certain *preciosity* of phrase which has a somewhat incongruous effect in a tale of rural life." *Quarterly Review*, April, 1932, p. 235.

Now if you consult the Oxford Dictionary, Vol. XV, page 1247, right after *precinct* you will find also *preciosity*, which was also spelt *preciosite*, *preciousite*, *preciosyte*, etc., with the variant *pretiosity*, showing how our ancestors lacked up-to-date pedagogical methods.

1. and 2. being the more literal meanings, we find:

3. Affectation of refinement or distinction, esp. in the use of language; fastidious refinement in literary style.

1866 CARLYLE *Remin.* I. 89 'Circle' he pronounced 'circul' with a certain *preciosity* which was noticeable slightly in other parts of his behaviour. 1887 H. D. TRAILL in *Macm. Mag.* July 176 The circles of Oxford *preciosity*. 1895 *Forum* (N. Y.) Oct. 191 The Parisian *preciosity* ridiculed by Molière. 1897 *Sat. Rev.* 20 Nov. 536 This . . . may be described as the *reductio ad absurdum* of the *preciosity* of Pater and Stevenson.

May I add that I am merely an observer, not an admirer of *preciosity*.

AT the annual meeting of the Catholic Poetry Society, which took place in New York City on February 24, Daniel Sargent paid skilled tribute to the poetry of Paul Claudel. Claudel, said Sargent, writes poems with his whole self. The entire man goes into them; all his imagination, his faith, his learning, his great worldly experience. The man who now represents France to America did not come to writing or rather thinking poetry when the lights were low, and the July moon shone upon the greensward. He became that way when he was alone in the interior of China, with nothing to read but the Bible and the Summa of St. Thomas Aquinas. The dust storms that are now sweeping the warring armies in Jehol swept into Claudel's face as he walked the deserts of China: the dust, as he said, of ancient Babylon, of the buried civilizations of Egypt, Assyria, Greece, and Rome, of all the dead past. Out of that solitude, out of that dust, he drew his philosophy.

Father Michael Earls, S.J., the sage of Holy Cross College, discoursed on Louise Imogen Guiney; and predicted that she would be great and glorified when he, and the rest of us, are also turned to dust.

Both of these poets, from what I have experienced of them, are fairly hard to understand. They demand much from the reader, just as they demanded a tremendous effort from themselves. Moreover, Claudel is obscure in ways unused by Miss Guiney. His French, even Frenchmen will acknowledge, needs a dictionary. So there is fulfilled in his high estate what Mr. Butler complained of in the PILGRIM's trifles. But he has no *preciosity*; any more than had Guiney. The *prétieux* uses words for their own sake alone. But for Claudel's obscure words there

is a reason, as there is for his intricate expression of thought. The key *can* be found; the parable interpreted.

HOW many words are actually obsolete? Or at least so unusual as to be of scarce any practical importance? Dictionaries from English into foreign languages are notorious sinners in that regard. Opening one of these at a chance page, I wonder what use the casual foreigner will find for such words as *hersillon*, *hest*, *heteroclitical*, *heteroscians*, *hexagynia*, *heyne*, etc.

Prof. Robert L. Ramsey, of the University of Missouri, cuts the Gordian knot by challenging Dr. Frank H. Vizetelly's estimate of 1,000,000 words in the English language, and Harold Wentworth's of two to three millions. "After adding in all the obsolete and alien words," says Professor Ramsey, "we reach a total of something like 250,000. . . . Over 50,000 of these are obsolete." And he adds:

Mr. Wentworth quotes the Oxford total as 414,825 words. But in so doing he is totally misleading us.

The Oxford grand total of 414,825, as clearly stated in the preface to its tenth and last volume is not a total of words at all, but of words and combinations. . . . The only reasonable total, it seems to me, is its total of main words, namely, 240,165. Of these main words, 54,464 are obsolete and 9,371 are alien words, leaving just 177,970 actual English words in current use. . . . It still leaves us with approximately three times as many words as any other language on earth.

However, says Dr. Vizetelly in explanation, this is the count of literary words. "In the scientific vocabulary there are easily 530,000 words. Slang and idioms, past and present will add at least another 200,000."

MUCH, too, could be said about that Assyrian dust, except that my space is up. Oil burners will drive trucks, as well as heat the studios of impecunious poets. Now comes along a truck-manufacturing company, from Clintonville, Wis., and claims that they are literally fulfilling the prophecy of Isaiah, xix, verse 23:

In that day there shall be a way [*m'sillah*, Protestant translation, highway] from Egypt to the Assyrians, and the Assyrian shall enter into Egypt, and the Egyptian to the Assyrians, and the Egyptians shall serve the Assyrian.

Ground for this interpretation is said to be the construction of the new motor road from Haifa in Egypt to Bagdad in Iraq, a 675-mile run, made in two or three days. The ancient Fathers of the Church, when they read that famous chapter of Isaiah, believed that the Prophet had in mind the introduction of Christianity into Egypt, as expressed in the following verse, which says that Israel shall be the third to the Egyptian and the Assyrian: "a blessing in the midst of the land." United States Jesuits are today making another "third" at the other end of that motor highway, bringing the blessing of the Faith to the parched land of Iraq. Like the driver of that motor truck, they are working unappalled by the storms of dust and sand. After all, to complete this Ash Wednesday meditation while the ashes are still upon my brow: what are all, poets and truck drivers and dictionary makers alike, but dust, and shall return thereto?

THE PILGRIM.

Back of Business

THERE is a widespread opinion in favor of a devaluated dollar. The dollar now contains about twenty-six grains of fine gold. A cut of the gold content to perhaps twenty grains would be a reduction of about twenty-five per cent. It is widely believed that prices would rise and debts fall in proportion, as if there were a magic formula, an intimate connection between dollar and prices: as if the dollar were a fixed standard, whereas prices are sometimes high and sometimes low. This is not so. The dollar does not make prices, but prices make the dollar. In 1919, the dollar was—to consumers—\$1.39; the following year it was \$1.54; in 1922 it was \$0.97; in 1930 only \$0.86; and now it is about \$0.63; only from 1923 to 1925 was it really worth a dollar. One can change it around and say: what we have today is the real dollar, and in 1919 we really had \$2.21. We would arrive at the same relative conclusion.

While the gold content could be reduced, either by repudiation or through the addition of silver for a bi-metallic standard, its effect upon prices and debts is more than doubtful. It is not gold that carries prices, but confidence or lack of confidence. With confidence, we may have anything for currency protection, paper or pebble stones. Without confidence, all the gold does not and cannot produce confidence. But any tinkering with gold as a symbol can very well undermine confidence.

Gold, in the popular opinion, is the safeguard of the currency. The fact that this opinion is economically thoroughly wrong, has nothing to do with the popular belief in gold. The first thing to happen after the reduction of the gold content of the dollar would be a scramble for gold, because people believe in gold today as they did 3,000 years ago. But would prices rise?

Prices rise for one reason only: demand for goods. This demand may have two motives: either people can afford to buy goods, which is certainly not true today; or people can afford to buy nothing but goods. This happens when a government starts printing money, when people lose confidence in money and turn to the only thing that has a value, namely goods.

The advocates of devaluation should bear in mind that prices have dropped, without any change in the gold content, for the last three years; that prices rose between 1922 and 1929 without any change in the gold content of the dollar; that the British sterling has been a model of stability since England suspended the gold standard in the fall of 1931; that the British index of the cost of living (prices) stands today precisely where it stood when the country went off gold. They should also remember that their faith in gold or the gold content of the dollar rests upon a currency standard which has doubled its value since 1920, and which has risen about forty per cent since the crash three years ago. The inevitable lesson from these experiences is the illusion of a devaluated dollar.

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD.

Education

P.S. Old Mother Hubbard

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

A LANK and earnest schoolman told me the other day that the cupboard was bare. A quaint comparison this, of school boards to old Mother Hubbard, but most apt too, for they are the very people who would keep old bones in a cupboard, with an active dog on the premises. But I did not burst into tears when I heard that the poor dog had none. I love dogs as well as the next, but not better; I am no cynophilist; if every dog is entitled to one bite, as the law lords teach, one may also hold that it is good for him to fare forth now and then to search out bones for himself, or to do without. In the open, under the pale glimpses of the moon, he can recapture fugitive apparitions of his sturdy ancestors, who took their bones, not waiting tamely to be served, and so become more like a dog, and less like one of those sniffing, bug-like creatures that our women carry about with them nowadays.

I have heard this parable so often of late, and in circumstances so varying, that I am not sure what it means. If old Mother Hubbard stands for our school administrators, I suppose the cupboard would represent the city treasury, and the boneless dog, our children. Any graduate student, I am sure, can graph the thing for you, with all sorts of curves and coordinates waving through rainbows of colored inks, and ending in perfect unintelligibility, or as you like it. Schoolmen seem to favor the interpretation I have suggested above, but other readings are possible. Several will be found in an essay contributed to the annual report of the Carnegie Foundation (New York: 1933) by Henry S. Pritchett, the Foundation's president emeritus.

Dr. Pritchett's opinion is, briefly, that for a number of years there have been far too many bones in the cupboard. The dogs have been living a Capuan existence, with the usual Capuan results. The cupboard, he writes, was "inflated," and now it is altogether necessary to consider "The Deflation of Public Education."

In what does this "inflation" consist? Those who have read this Review for the last twenty years (or for the last two, for that matter) know the answer, for it has been set forth in AMERICA again and again. The organized agencies of public education, writes Dr. Pritchett, have followed the example of the industrial agencies, so that along with overproduction in manufactures "there has been a comparable overproduction in the products of the tax-supported system of education."

The public-school system (from elementary school to university) is in much the position of a hotel that has for long offered a bill of fare of lavish proportions in which one did not always find a simple and wholesome meal. The time has come when it can no longer offer so extravagant a menu. Fortunate it will be if it can continue to offer a simpler fare in simpler surroundings.

And again:

The inflation has resulted in a multiplication of subjects taught, in costly and expensive school buildings, and in a vast increase

in the number of those kept in school beyond the point where the school was fruitful; and inevitably there has come a rise in the cost. In the case of one large community whose budget was recently examined, the school system cost nearly sixty per cent of the total municipal income, and at the rate of growth in expenditure that has held for the past ten years, *the entire income of the community will be absorbed, in another decade and a half, by the support of public education. And this is no unusual picture.* (Italics inserted.)

But it is a picture made necessary by the folly which in this country passes for tax-supported education. All boys and girls must go to school even when for them the school, in Dr. Pritchett's delicate phrase, is not "fruitful," no matter what the cost to the city in dollars, and the cost to them in something far more valuable than dollars. Should the pupil fail to attain a passing mark, "a more subtle and dangerous factor" is introduced into the problem, and it consists in "the political pressure that parents can, and do bring upon a teacher. . . . When the disgruntled parent of a dull child complains to the supervisor, and he in turn complains to the principal of the school, only a principal of courage will give the teacher the protection he deserves." A long story of shameful tyranny is summed up in Dr. Pritchett's indictment.

"For industry, and no less for education, a day of reckoning has come." Instead of adding new courses and looking for other objects and activities on which to impose an added tax, school authorities must prepare for retrenchments, in the interests of education no less than in the interests of economy. They must find a better "adjustment of tax-supported education to the intellectual needs and the financial resources of the States," than we have at present, writes Dr. Pritchett, or have had for years. Put bluntly, we have been paying a high price for an inferior, sometimes a worthless, article.

In Dr. Pritchett's opinion, readjustment should follow these general lines.

1. Courses of study in the primary school should be fewer and simpler. It should not be the aim of the school to fill the pupil with information, but to train his mind. "In other words, character and the ability to think are the real aims of the elementary school." The elementary school should not exact a fee, "but the purchase of books by the State should cease. The American people are being made soft by this sort of coddling." Quite true, but what school board in the United States will agree?

2. Dr. Pritchett's next recommendation is plainly revolutionary. "The secondary school should carry a tuition fee." This, I am sure, will expose him to a raking fire from the guns of the National Education Association, and every politico-pedagogue in the country will take a shot at him. In the confusion I retire, appalled at my bravery in even quoting so frightful a proposal.

3. Standards of admission to the secondary school should be high enough to exclude "the manifestly unfit." Dr. Pritchett here assumes that the secondary school is a place in which a child continues its education, and not merely a place which enables him to comply with the compulsory attendance law. As the assumption is largely groundless, the suggestion has little value.

4. The curriculum in the secondary schools should be simplified. At present they offer "the most amazing mass of studies, literary, scientific and vocational. Everything, from philosophy to journalism, can be studied, in name, at least, in the secondary schools in our county." Dr. Pritchett believes that a more simple and "sincere" regime would be not only less expensive, but more profitable both to the pupil and to the community.

5. The cost of college and university training should be borne wholly, or at least in greater part, by those who partake of its benefits. "We have far overdone the matter of free education," writes Dr. Pritchett. "Considerations of a national character, no less than those of necessary economy, point to the need of a system that shall be . . . dependent for its support, above the grade school, in the main, upon the tuitions of those who are the beneficiaries of the higher institutions." There is no more reason why the State should provide a boy with a college education, free of charge, than that it should furnish him with free food and free clothes. The City of New York maintains huge institutions of college rank in which young men and women are educated, free of charge, and this, too, although it would be cheaper for the city to send them to private institutions, and pay their tuition fees. To the State university, we have added in many parts of the country the city college and university, all dubbed "free," and all expanding enormously year by year the taxpayers' bill.

Dr. Pritchett is confident that "a far-reaching reorganization of tax-supported education is inevitable." I wish that I could share his quiet confidence, but I think that Dr. Pritchett is hopelessly wrong. If there is to be any reorganization it will be, most emphatically, in the direction of more money for the public schools. Even in this year of unprecedented depression, the schools will get more, in proportion to the country's total disbursements, than they did in 1929. I do not mean, of course, that the teachers, who do the only good work that is done in the system, quite commonly in spite of their alleged superiors, will get more, for in some cities they are getting nothing. The real recipients you can name for yourselves, after a survey of the local field. Furthermore, the political pedagogues are no longer content to wring the last penny from their own communities, but have begun a panhandler's march on Washington. Writing in the *Times* for February 26, Dean Russell, of Teachers College, New York, asserts that we must now have "a national plan for financing education, to equalize the differences among the States."

If it is proper for New Jersey to go to the rescue of the shore resorts [in New Jersey] it is logical that the United States as a whole should go to the aid of the children of Alabama and Arkansas. Chicago cannot collect its own taxes, but Washington can.

If that is logic, then I am old Aristotle, in person. The concluding sentence is either bad law, or atrocious grammar. Whose taxes can Washington collect? Chicago's? Not unless the Government has changed overnight. Or its own? In any case, the purpose asserted by Dean Russell is quite plain. The schools must have not only local

but Federal support. Dean Russell answers Dr. Pritchett with finality.

"The basic trouble with the public schools is that they have fallen into the hands of a well-organized and extremely ambitious bureaucracy, and that machinery for curbing its pretensions has yet to be devised." That quotation is not from Dr. Pritchett, but from Brother Mencken, of Baltimore. I hesitate to cite a gentleman who once asserted that he had read through the whole of Suarez on a summer afternoon; still, even a clock with a broken mainspring happens to be right twice a day. While Mencken's general record is not so good, I think that this time he is accurate to a split second. I can prove it by Dean Russell.

Sociology

A Compulsory Work-Sharing Plan

M. M. HOFFMANN

A NATIONAL compulsory share-the-work plan, instead of the present spasmodic and sporadic voluntary system, would prove of immense benefit to the American working classes. The recent article in *AMERICA* by Father Blakely, S.J., on the share-the-work plan has shown very clearly the glaring weakness of the system in failing to provide sufficient wages for those whom it would benefit. From other sources there has come ample confirmation of Father Blakely's view. Striking among them is the statement of A. F. Whitney, president of the Railroad Trainmen, denouncing the idea and showing that the system spreads the burden of unemployment on the community, and serves to relieve capital and the State.

But just as Mr. Whitney's argument failed of anything like general acceptance, even among members of his own organization, so are all similar arguments being brusquely waved aside today by advocates of the plan. Just a few weeks ago the State Unemployment Commission of California, the chairman of which is the Most Rev. Edward J. Hanna, Archbishop of San Francisco, in a report to Governor Rolph, recommended a five-day week and a six-hour day in all public works of the State, and urged the State Department of Industrial Relations to encourage the plan as a means of promoting the spreading of work in industries. In his last report, that of January 21, Walter C. Teagle, chairman of the share-the-work committee, claims that by the adoption of shorter working schedules, industries throughout the country have supplied jobs for about 5,000,000 men and women who otherwise would be idle. 91,000 business houses and firms reported to the committee, which stated that an analysis of 21,884 of the returns showed that seventy-seven per cent had come from establishments which were operating on a work-sharing basis as an "emergency measure to carry their employees through the depression."

There you have it: the plan is regarded at best as a mere emergency measure to meet the present depression. It does increase the number of the employed, and it is further hoped that through this increase, the more widely

distributed purchasing power of the laboring classes will ultimately stimulate trade. But there is no doubt about the fact that this has resulted and will continue to result in wage cutting, or, as Father Blakely so aptly put it, "for every man who goes back to work, another man has his wages cut in half."

In the present industrial crisis, the share-the-work plan is probably the only one that promises fairly wide acceptance among employers. Certainly, the number of those favoring it and accepting it is constantly growing. As long as it is merely voluntary and optional, and can be dropped by employers as soon as an upward trend in industrial conditions manifests itself, it will not prove of much avail to the laboring classes. But let it be made nationally compulsory, and the plan will be of great merit and assistance, not only to the workers themselves, but to the employers likewise.

The demand of the American Federation of Labor at its recent Cincinnati convention for the thirty-hour week had this very objective in view. It was realized that the present plan will, after all, appeal to but a large minority of the employers of the country at best, and with the first intimation of an approach toward prosperous times, it will immediately be dropped in favor of the longer week. Nail the plan down now by Federal compulsion throughout the nation, and a great advance toward the solution of unemployment will have been made.

According to the "World Almanac" for 1933, and practically all authorities, of the 48,000,000 normally employed in gainful occupations in the United States, there were approximately 11,000,000 persons unemployed in 1932. According to Walter C. Teagle's recent optimistic reports, this latter figure is being materially cut into by the share-the-work plan. Should the plan be made compulsory throughout the forty-eight States, not only would the figures be tremendously reduced, but with the slightest return toward normal industrial conditions, the demand for labor would cause an immediate increase in wages. Short of an ideal minimum-wage law, which would be so difficult of enactment and so problematical of success, a compulsory national share-the-work plan would probably be more certain of assuring the worker of a Christian living wage, than anything else hitherto proposed.

Father Blakely asked whether Congress had gone to the limits of its constitutional authority in seeking ways and means to provide employment. By no means. A Federal law could without difficulty be enacted which would give to Congress the right to limit the number of hours each man would be permitted to work each week. Such was the idea in the mind of the convention of the American Federation of Labor in Cincinnati. The law would be created either by amendment to the Federal Constitution, or under the present interstate commerce clause. The legality of the latter method is clearly and convincingly set forth in the *Congressional Record* of January 13, 1932. This law could be made compulsory, for instance, for all firms engaged in inter-state commerce which employed fifty or more persons, and even under present adverse conditions, this would reduce most remarkably

the number of unemployed. With only a slight amelioration of industrial conditions, it would almost strike a balance between the number of jobs and the number of laborers. No man engaged in productive labor would be permitted to work more hours per week than allowed by the Federal law, unless he received time and one-half for overtime. This system would speedily raise the level of wages throughout the country. Firms not engaged in inter-State commerce could be induced to adopt the provisions of the Federal law, by permitting them, for instance, to make use of a share-the-work emblem used only by all firms acting according to the law, and which like the union label, would make a strong appeal to the mass of the consuming public.

In his recent book, "Jobs, Machines, and Capitalism," Arthur Dahlberg has brought out admirably this case for a shorter working day. Our capitalism has almost always operated with ten men bidding for from nine to seven jobs. With Federal force behind a national share-the-work plan, the supply of labor in normal times will probably be always less than the demand for it. When employers want ten men and find only nine available, our capitalism will almost automatically cure itself of its own evils. Both Dr. Dahlberg in his study and J. A. Prudot in his booklet, "A Job for Every Man," show that it is only by a "shortage of labor" that the present bargaining situation, so depressing for labor, can be reversed. Both lay stress on conditions prevailing during the War when a labor shortage was created by absorbing about 4,000,000 men into the military service of the country. Capital behaved better then, not because of "patriotism," which would appeal to its heartlessness with no more success than would Christianity, but simply because of "scarcity of labor."

A share-the-work plan which would benefit the laborers could not be enacted by appealing to altruistic motives. Under a national compulsory system, the increased prosperity and purchasing power of the working masses would redound to the benefit of the capitalists. Their own economic self-interest as well as the Christian sentiments of the rest of us, ought to provoke the nation to enact a compulsory law for a shorter working day and week.

LIGHTS OF HOME

Now spectral contours of empurpled hill
Printed upon a pallid evening sky
Rear ghostly palaces whose beauties fill
The spacious dusk with Titan mansionry.
Floods of the hidden rushing river spill
Their surging torrents when day's clamors die
Within a shell of silence, patterning still
From cadenced ripple fluent melody.

Mysterious and unfamiliar grow
The obvious things of unpretentious day,
Where tossing pine trees sigh in winds that blow
Gusty with rain from mottled clouds of gray.
Alone transfusing all the gathering gloom,
Lambent in shadowy fields flame lights of home.

AMY BROOKS MAGINNIS.

Dramatics

Catholic Amateurs and the Play

* KATHERINE BREGY

THE problems of the theater, like the problems of the poor, are always with us, as varied and as intricate, if not as vital. But it is just as well to remind ourselves that they *are* vital: to realize that there was perhaps more psychology than frivolity in the Roman emperor who, when bread was particularly scarce among his people, advised diverting their attention to circuses. Obviously it is when life—our own personal life and the general life around us—grows painful, that we wish and need to escape from it into a dream world moulded “nearer to the heart’s desire.” And if Faith is the highest and fullest escape, that is no reason to despise the lower orders of the hierarchy mercifully granted to man, among which the arts seem always to mingle something divine and eternal with their quintessential humanity. One likes to remember that Dante carried these arts—music, architecture, the dance, as well as poetry—not only into his Purgatory but even into his Heaven. And it is arrestingly apropos of our present subject not to forget that in the Earthly Paradise where he rejoins Beatrice and prepares for his sublime ascent, he is confronted by a pageant which is very nearly a play!

So the question of drama becomes not less but really more important in stressful times like our own. The professional, commercial theater sooner or later adjusts itself by the law of supply and demand. When people have less money than usual to spend they are more critical how they spend it; so the poor play generally goes under a little more precipitately, while the play which survives its first season generally has something real to commend it. But in the enormous field of amateur dramatics there was until recently almost no law of supply and demand. The producing group, club or school or parish or charity, decided what it wanted to give, and the audience took what was given with as much grace as possible.

Today, the economic factor is changing this facile condition also. Most people would rather give their alms outright to some good cause than be obliged to sit through a boring performance. And most amateur actors, having learned that to rehearse and produce a worth-while play is immeasurably more exciting and no more arduous than to put on something quite ordinary, are becoming increasingly ambitious, increasingly aware of professional, even of artistic ideals. And the more ambitious they become, first in choice of a play, then in its presentation, the better for both sides of the curtain.

These somewhat rambling thoughts have been crystallized by inquiries constantly coming in from Catholic groups throughout the country, and by going through a number of recent publications bearing on these inquiries. The strictly juvenile play may be considered a problem in itself and would need a paper to itself; although the several professional companies now producing plays for juveniles and adolescents—all the way from “Robin

Hood” or the perennial “Alice” to “Little Women” and “Treasure Island”—might suggest interesting solutions.

The matter I am trying at present to discuss is that of the “grown-up” play, for Catholic colleges or adult groups and audiences. There is, of course, no reason why it need be a religious play; although our secular theater and opera, too, have been rediscovering during the past few years how enchantingly beautiful the religious drama can be. In fact, it may be a romance, a tragedy, a comedy, a farce, a fantasy, or a detective “thriller”; only it goes without saying that if produced under Catholic auspices, a drama should contain nothing offensive to an educated adult Catholic taste. Personally, I think Catholic amateurs should go one step higher, that the “obligations of nobility” should urge them to choose always the *best*, not the least good vehicle the occasion can bear. I think they may very well wish their work to be not only diverting but distinguished.

And now, just what have these countless, groping little companies to choose from? They have, naturally, the immense body of so-called classic drama which everybody knows, and which cannot be bettered for certain functions. And they have a semi-classic group of costume plays including delightful short ones such as Stuart Walker gives us. For Christmas and Eastertide performances they have Robert Hugh Benson’s fine and familiar miracle plays. Lawrence Houseman’s almost perfect “Bethlehem,” Don Marquis’ “Dark Hours,” and Father Talbot’s arresting series, “Shining in Darkness.” Henri Gheon’s vivacious dramatizing of the various saints, Paul Claudel’s “Nuit de Noël de 1914,” or, for a very ambitious performance, his mystical “Tidings Brought to Mary,” as well as W. B. Yeats’ “Hour Glass,” offer magnificent possibilities for semi-devotional productions.

Demands for St. Patrick’s Day plays are so repeated that one wonders why some capable Catholic dramatist does not use the immensely dramatic possibilities of the Saint’s own life. Lacking this, there remains a wealth of recent Irish drama, both short and long, to choose from. Just here one is reminded of the single possible flaw in the repertoire of the inimitable Abbey Players: why do they hold almost entirely to the realistic plays, brilliant but often bitter studies of peasant or tenement life, to the utter neglect of their rich imaginative drama? We see Lady Gregory’s “Rising of the Moon” and “Workhouse Ward,” but almost never her noble miracle play, “The Travelling Man”; while Yeats’ “Hour Glass” or “Deirdre,” the fascinating, ironic fantasies of Lord Dunsany, and Padraic Colum’s memorable “Miracle of the Corn,” seem to be left for our amateurs if they are to be seen at all.

Often, of course, what is needed is a “popular” rather than a “literary” play. Here one may choose judiciously from recently released stage successes; while the publishing market is literally flooded with one-act plays, which have the double advantage of variety in subject and in cast. A recent group of these is “One Act Plays for Stage and Study” (Seventh Series), issued by Samuel

French, with a preface by Zona Gale. It contains thirty-one rather interesting, rather sophisticated tabloid dramas by well-known English and American authors, on subjects ranging all the way from the French Revolution or the "star-crossed" poet Chatterton to the modern flapper. Not all of these plays are suitable for Catholic amateurs—nor all of the fifteen playlets in "New Plays for Women and Girls," from the same publishing house, although several could be enjoyably used. One thing against which our producers must be on their guard is the easy and banal acceptance of divorce which has become increasingly common in recent plays for amateurs, as also in professional plays and motion pictures.

Interesting and of considerable variety are the "Small Plays for Small Casts" (Penn Publishing Co.), by Elizabeth Hall Yates, while Dan Totheroe's "One Act Plays for Everyone" (Samuel French) almost live up to their title by offering versatile and dramatic, even at moments melodramatic, slices of life. They include an Italian immigrant study, a sea tale, a tense story of entombed miners and their waiting women, and two particularly charming Chinese fantasies. Mr. Totheroe is at his least probable when he "goes Irish," for those moments succeed only in making one long for the tart realism, the unforgettable dialogue, and far-flung imagination of authentic Celtic drama. And obviously, there is not only room for but need of short plays with a Catholic background and motivation, if only they were written with the skill and charm of, for instance, Father Talbot or Father Lord. Such an anthology would find a wide welcome. And the recent visit of Hilary Pepler has shown what fine effects, both secular and religious, can be won merely by simple but well-directed pantomime.

Prof. Wayne Campbell, of Oklahoma City University, gives in "Amateur Acting and Play Production" (Macmillan) a few crude but suggestive plot outlines with many workable "laboratory" suggestions. His treatment of the psychology and cure of stage fright is perhaps the most important thing in the volume. But by all odds the best book on this subject known to the present writer is "The Art of Play Production" (Harper), by Prof. John Dolman of the University of Pennsylvania. Here the author not only gives a wealth of practical, creative advice upon the problems of acting and directing but also traces the historical aspect of the theater from Greek and Roman times to our own, discussing such psychological matters as the control of attention, abandon and repression in acting, the study of the abstract idea behind the plot of a play, and modern stagecraft in its somewhat bewildering varieties of realism, symbolism, stylization, constructivism, etc. All in all, this may be considered one of the few indispensable books for any college or amateur society seeking, in the words of its own preface, "to build up a permanent and artistic producing group."

Finally, since the study and production of plays should lead eventually to the creation of plays, we have that unusual volume, "The Art of Playwriting," published by the University of Pennsylvania, which has been respon-

sible, as has Harvard and as has Yale in recent years, for so much contributive work in the field of drama. With a brief foreword by one of the greatest authorities on the study of American drama, Dr. Arthur Hobson Quinn, this book brings together a special series of lectures by outstanding dramatists delivered a few years ago at that University. The first of these is "Writing and Playwriting," by Jesse Lynch Williams, a practical study of the theater from inside, insisting upon acting rather than reading as a test of drama, and upon the too often forgotten fact that the play speaks through the emotions to the mind while the novel speaks through the mind to the emotions. Langdon Mitchell's "Substance and Art in the Drama," also, shows a wholesome concern for the audience, and quotes Synge's profound observation that "modern intellectual drama is perishing from a lack of joy." The practical side is again stressed by that experienced actor and playwright, Gilbert Emery, while Lord Dunsany writes eloquently from the poetic and imaginative angle in "The Carving of the Ivory." His two most important contentions, and they *are* important, are that: "The public spirit is weighted down by the body and by all material things, and with the round of every day. The public only wants an opportunity to soar for an hour or two." And again: "The whole thing of the play is the meaning that underlies the events and why they happen and why they happen irresistibly."

Possibly the most inclusive and fundamental article of the whole series is "The Construction of a Play," by the American woman best equipped to treat it, Rachel Crothers. Mrs. Crothers has small patience with would-be dramatists who will not take the trouble to learn their craft, with "arty" and faddy little theaters, and also with the unnecessary coarseness of many recent productions. Her concern is with that "intelligent and subtle drama," often conveying its message by talk rather than by action, which is the particular achievement of the modern playwright. And she echoes the perfectly justifiable complaint of amateur, professional, and audience, too—particularly the Catholic audience, which is committed *ipso facto* to certain ideals—in her remark: "When one thinks of what the theater might be—one weeps for what it is not!"

One does. . . .

But working, after all, usually proves a better remedy than weeping. Almost anything can be accomplished, if our amateurs will only remember that nothing is more important than the play except the acting—and that nothing is more important than the acting except the play!

REVIEWS

Early Protestant Educators: The Educational Writings of Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Other Leaders of Protestant Thought. By FREDERICK EBY, Ph.D., LL.D. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. \$2.25.

This is one of the series of educational classics published by the McGraw-Hill Book Company to meet the demand for source material in the study of the history of education. A generous selection is given from the works of Luther, Knox, and Calvin; other minor writers of the Reformation period are included, as well as several school ordinances. Each section of source material is

preceded by, in the main, an admirable appreciation of the educational significance of the writer. The viewpoint of Dr. Eby is distinctly Protestant and sympathetic, yet there is a conscious attempt, not always successful, to be impartial. He is not misled into the historical inaccuracy of supposing that popular education was unknown before Luther's time. Indeed, many will not agree with his contention that Luther did little directly for the common schools. On the other hand, against his view that Luther "did more than any one else to establish the Latin schools," there are authorities as potent as Erasmus, Janssen, Von Döllinger, and Paulsen. It is to be regretted that in presenting Calvin's doctrine of total depravity, of such tremendous import in Protestant educational theory and practice, Dr. Eby did not present the sane traditional Catholic doctrine of the effects of original sin. That, after all, is the whole crux of educational philosophy. Between Rousseau's essential goodness and Calvin's essential badness stands the *via media* of the ancient Church, to which the world must return if there is to be sanity in thinking and practice in the educational world. The Catholic position and the Calvinist differ only by a letter, but what a world of difference it makes. To Calvin human nature was depraved by reason of the fall; to the Catholic human nature was deprived but gloriously restored through the redemptive work of Christ our Lord.

W. J. McG.

Edward VII, Man and King. By H. E. WORTHAM. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. \$4.00.

A charmingly frank portrait, evaluating nicely the petty weaknesses and the great strength of a man in whom they were oddly mixed; the king at whose death Lord Morley wrote: "The feeling of grief and of personal loss throughout the country, indeed throughout Western Europe, is extraordinary and without a single jarring note." That the Spartan training of his boyhood and adolescence, supervised with Teutonic inflexibility by his father, Prince Albert, and Baron Stockmar, somehow failed to break the natural resiliency of his spirit is attested by his charm and capacity for enjoyment which won the hearts of all classes on his American visit at the age of eighteen. At twenty, despite his father's insistence on belles-lettres, Edward was much more at home in *le beau monde*. "Never was a prince more at home in all worlds," his biographer says of him. But that his life was much more than a rout of pleasure we learn from the contrary forces against which he had to fight; for he was accused by the Tories of being half a Radical, frowned on by the Radicals for his love of pleasure, scoffed at by many as pro-German and scolded by the Queen because he was pro-French. His first diplomatic achievement was the improving of relations between the British Empire and the Third Republic by winning over the French statesman, Gambetta. When at long last, with the passing of his aged mother, he became "Eduardus Rex," he knew full well that he was but an ordinary man of mediocre talent. Yet he had withal a truly regal pride. On the very day of his mother's funeral—and her going deeply grieved him—seeing the half-masted flag on the royal yacht, he asked the reason. "The Queen is dead, Sir," replied the Captain. "The King of England lives," said Edward, and ordered the flag flown from the mast-head. He won the unbounded confidence of his subjects, even his Irish subjects, partly no doubt because of a well-founded belief in the soundness of his common-sense, surely no less because of his tremendous resource, energy, and courage. It is a pity that the author of so charming a biography should mar his work by a passing slur or two at the Catholic hierarchy.

J. F. X. H.

Kate Chopin and Her Creole Stories. By DANIEL S. RANKIN. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. \$3.00.

That a woman of thirty-five, who had never considered writing for publication or consciously prepared for such a vocation, should suddenly begin to turn out stories which almost from the first were welcomed by editors, verges on the wonderful. And since these stories were no amateur or sensational performances, but

miniature masterpieces, it must be conceded that their author was something of a genius. Kate O'Flaherty was born in St. Louis in 1851. She married Oscar Chopin when she was twenty, went on a honeymoon trip to Europe, lived for ten years in New Orleans and three years at Cloutierville in central Louisiana. Then, losing her husband, she returned to St. Louis with their six children and made that city her home until, in 1904, death came suddenly. Her friends knew her as a retiring, charming woman with none of the foibles of a celebrity—one wishes that more of their reminiscences of her were included in this book: of such as are given, without doubt the most delightful are those provided by her girlhood friend, Mother (Kitty) Garesché. Two volumes of Kate Chopin's Creole stories appeared during her lifetime; and also two novels, one of which, showing *fin-de-siècle* influences, succeeded in creating a small furor. Many more tales still exist only in the back files of magazines. Father Rankin has resurrected some of these and printed them in the latter half of his book. They give conclusive proof of their author's mastery of the story teller's art and her knowledge of Creole life and manners: especially illustrative are "A Family Affair" and "The Godmother." Her appeal is universal: "It is her understanding," says Father Rankin, "of the elemental human emotions of love, hate, fear, and pride that lends power to the stories of Kate Chopin"; and her restricted locale, embracing as it does a romantic and little known corner of the earth, far from narrowing the interest, imparts a quaint and agreeable flavor.

P. K.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Educational.—It is not clear what purpose the publishers had in mind in bringing out in English dress Dr. Otto Rank's "Modern Education" (Knopf. \$2.50). For despite the puff given the author on the jacket by Havelock Ellis, who hails him as "perhaps the most brilliant and clairvoyant" of Freud's many pupils and associates, it must be confessed that the book makes dull reading. Nevertheless, it is not without interest that Rank does not hesitate to disagree with his master, most intelligently in the chapter on "Sexual Enlightenment," where he admits that the Freudian technique of sexual instruction has proven a dismal failure. Unfortunately the author has no better substitute to offer.

"The Founding of American Colleges and Universities before the Civil War" (Teachers College, Columbia University. \$2.50) is a doctoral dissertation by Donald G. Tewksbury. As it is a factual study of the forces at work in the development of higher education in the United States before the Civil War, there is little room for appreciation of the heroic effort back of this movement. Nevertheless, one fact emerges from this study: it was the Christian faith of Catholic and non-Catholic alike that created our early colleges and universities.

"All the good of money," says Dr. James Hardy Dillard, the veteran Southern educator, "spent on school-houses, blackboards, desks, maps, tools, and teachers, hangs just on this—helping George to be a man who has the right idea of doing things right." Dr. Dillard's homely, but shrewd philosophy of education, never has been more timely than today. Some of his thoughts are gathered up in the booklet: "Selected Writings of James Hardy Dillard" (John F. Slater Fund, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D. C.) and have already become household words in the South.

French Spiritual Books.—"Cours de Religion" (Téqui. 6 fr.), in fifty-two lectures, by E. Duplessy, deals with each of the Seven Sacraments in a very succinct, precise, and attractive way. The author does not omit anything essential. His proofs, although dogmatic, are clear and convincing. He omits those subtle questions that would tend to bewilder rather than enlighten his auditors.

In his attractive treatise, "St. Joseph" (Lethielleux. 20 fr.), Cardinal A. H. M. Lépicié divides his subject into three parts: (1) the greatest Patriarch's share in the Divine Plan of Redemption; (2) his perfections; and (3) his relation to the Catholic

Church. His delineation of the Saint is perfect and calculated to inspire one with reverence and devotion to the Spouse of the Mother of God.

Religious Life.—In "Bethanie" (Bernard Grasset, Paris. 15 fr.) Father de Boissieu gives a clear, straightforward account of the religious congregation founded by Père Lataste, O.P., for the protection and spiritual perfection of social unfortunates. Père Lataste's genius revealed itself in his decision to have the *rehabilités* live in the same community with the *soeurs de choeur*. There was to be no discrimination between them in the ordinary household appointments and tasks. It was to be a mutual effort to serve God and help one another to serve Him. The story of the institute's later incorporation with the Dominican Order, its rapid progress and spread and the outline of its constitutions round out Père de Boissieu's interesting and instructive work.

The discourses which Father Gillis delivered in the Catholic Hour under the auspices of the National Council of Catholic men are contained in "Christianity and Civilization" (Paulist Press. \$1.00). In this work of 120 pages we have a collection of interesting and scholarly sermons under the titles: Sources of Civilization; Personal Moral Responsibility; The Principle of Tolerance; The Brotherhood of Man; Womanhood under Christianity; The Principle of Mercy; The Principle of Enthusiasm; The Principle of Optimism; The Prince of Peace. These discourses are most timely since the author gives us not only an exposition of the Catholic doctrine but an able refutation of modern theories of religion and morality.

Anthropological.—"Taboo, Magic, Spirits" (Macmillan. \$2.00), by Eli Edward Burris, begins with a discussion of "the mind of primitive man." The gist of these pages is that "early man, in common with present-day savages, was unable to form correct inference concerning the world about him." The volume contains other similar errors based on the exploded theory of unilinear cultural evolution. The book is valuable when the author limits himself to classical antiquities, but unreliable when he interprets his findings in the light of primitive culture.

Prof. C. G. Seligman has already won a place in anthropologic literature by his work on the Veddas. In the present book, "Races of Africa" (Holt. \$1.25), we find data on important African tribes. Some excellent figures add to the value of the book, though we regret that the literature cited in the appendix does not mention the contributions of Father Paul Schebesta, S.V.D., and those of Dr. Victor Lebelzter. The volume will be useful for reference on many points of primitive African culture.

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

ADJUSTMENT AND MASTERY. Robert S. Woodworth. \$1.00. Century.
 ARGENTINE TANGO. Philip Guedalla. \$3.00. Harper.
 BLARNEY STONE. THE. Edward E. Rose. 75 cents. French.
 BREAKING INTO PRINT. F. Fraser Bond. \$2.00. McGraw-Hill.
 BY POST TO THE APOSTLES. Helen Walker Homan. \$2.50. Minton, Balch.
 CLUE OF THE EYELASH. THE. Carolyn Wells. \$2.00. Lippincott.
 DEATH AT HEEL. Fred Andreas. \$2.00. Holt.
 EEL PIE MURDERS. THE. David Frome. \$2.00. Farrar and Rinehart.
 GEMS OF LITERATURE. Glenn S. Nevins. \$1.00. Published by the author.
 GLEN HAZARD. Maristan Chapman. \$2.35. Knopf.
 HIDDEN DOOR. THE. Frank L. Packard. \$2.00. Doubleday, Doran.
 IRISH EYES. Edward E. Rose. 75 cents. French.
 IS THERE A GOD? Henry Nelson Wieman. Douglas Clyde Macintosh, and Max Carl Otto. \$2.50. Willett, Clark.
 LATE CHRISTOPHER BEAN. THE. Sidney Howard. \$2.00. French.
 LEGEND OF SUSAN DANE. THE. Ruth Comfort Mitchell. \$2.00. Appleton.
 MAKING OF NICHOLAS LONGWORTH. THE. Clara Longworth de Chambrun. \$3.00. Long and Smith.
 MAN NAMED LUKE. A. March Cost. \$2.35. Knopf.
 MAYTIME IN ERIN. Edward E. Rose. 75 cents. French.
 MEN OF MORGAN. John Murray Reynolds. \$2.00. Appleton.
 MISS CHARLESWORTH. Mabel L. Tyrell. \$2.00. Stokes.
 MOON IN THE WEST. Bertrand Collins. \$2.00. Liveright.
 MORMON TRAIL. THE. George B. Rodney. \$3.00. Clode.
 PSYCHOLOGY OF SEX. Havelock Ellis. \$3.00. Long and Smith.
 ROMEWARDS. C. J. Eustace. \$2.25. Benziger.
 SAINT FRANCIS DE SALES. Louis Sempé. S.J. \$1.25. Bruce.
 SAUNDERS OAK. Robert Reynolds. \$2.50. Harper.
 SNAP OUT OF IT! Billy B. Van. \$1.00. Stratford.
 SONNETS. Mary Dixon Thayer. \$1.00. Macmillan.
 STRANGER ON THE ISLAND. THE. Brand Whitlock. \$2.00. Appleton.
 STUDIES IN SUBLIME FAILURE. Shane Leslie. \$3.75. Scribner's.

The Drift Fence. Hindoo Holiday. Belinda Grove. Pageant, a Novel of Tasmania. Foul Weather.

"The Drift Fence" (Harper. \$2.00), by Zane Grey, will be eagerly sought after by his many devotees. A typical country fair with its banter and laughter, followed by a rodeo with its foam-flecked mounts, serve to introduce the reader to the *dramatis personae*. The play is on! With avid interest we follow the ups and downs of Jim Traft, ever the protagonist, with Molly Dunn, of the Dunns of Cibique, playing up to him, and always the Drift Fence, like some sinister mephisto, trying to weave its web of ruin around the twain. But love knows no barriers, even a drift fence, and the climax is all that could be desired. In that it is like all Zane Grey's books, clean and wholesome from cover to cover, exciting and yet not lurid, and with a technique of the ranch that none has equaled. Young and old will enjoy it.

Rarely does so-called English humor appeal to the American public, and yet not a year passes but several such works are foisted upon us by the publishers, and their blatant blurbs assure us by sundry quotations (from English papers for the most part) that the advertised work is simply side splitting. "Hindoo Holiday" (Viking. \$2.50), by J. R. Ackerley, falls into this category. A young Briton, with his new college degree in his pocket, goes to India as a tutor to the son of a petty prince of that vast empire. Really, however, his job is to dance attendance on his Royal Highness, and pamper his childish whims. Page after page of small talk, much of it a sort of repetition, fills out the book. The coarser side of this sensuous people is all too candidly told, and most of the time it could have been conveniently omitted.

"Belinda Grove" (Doubleday Doran. \$2.50), by Helen Ashton, is the history of a beautiful house in London from its erection in 1815 to its demolition in 1932. During the Regency the mansion was the country estate of a titled gambler, and it acquired a ghost when its disreputable master murdered an honest old sea captain. Changes come with the years. The house becomes successively the residence of a merchant prince, a mad woman, a lady novelist, an indigent artist, a young doctor, a disreputable fortune teller, and finally the studio of a film company. The novel really consists of a series of narrative essays flimsily bound together by a unity of place, with the amiable ghost as the symbolic *genius loci*. "Belinda Grove" is a pleasantly nostalgic history in which the quality of mystery is not strained. It is safe and sane and may be recommended to convalescent ladies.

"Pageant, a Novel of Tasmania" (Century. \$2.50) is written by a native of Tasmania who goes under the pen name of G. B. Lancaster. Although it is filled with descriptive and historical details, the story does not successfully evoke the panorama of Tasmania; its real concern, like that of most stories written by women, is with the personal, and especially the sexual, relations of men and women. In that, the story shows power; a tragic, somber power, utterly unrelieved by either humor or hope. Most of the characters are portrayed as hateful, a few as pitiful. The central person in the story, Jenny Comyn, grows through disillusionment into an embittered, but bravely proud, old maid. Admiration for her *panache*, her high, despairing courage, is the ultimate spiritual reach of the author. In the rare places where religion appears at all in the story, it is only the revolting travesty of religion, which, unfortunately, is all too common in the actual world.

American literature is little richer for George Gibbs' mediocre endeavor in "Foul Weather" (Appleton. \$2.00). The story, which might be laid aside by the reader at any time without appreciable violence to his curiosity, centers about the captain and mate of the *Witch*, and a woman whom they rescue in mid-ocean. Melisse is alone in the world, and both men cultivate an interest in her, and because the mate knows the doubtful habits of his captain, there is trouble. The characters are described more often than portrayed, and the tale is not a smoothly flowing whole, but rather a jerky series of episodes, arranged usually in chronological order. The general impression created on the reader is that Mr. Gibbs wrote the book in his dull moments, without any real guiding star.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Bond-Market Trend

To the Editor of AMERICA:

During the past year I have enjoyed reading many of Gerhard Hirschfeld's columns under the heading "Back of Business." But I cannot refrain from taking issue with his article in the issue of AMERICA for January 21 concerning movements in the American bond market.

Mr. Hirschfeld refers to the recent upward movement in the domestic bond market as a tendency to take huge funds away from business in general where, as he points out, there is a bitter need for loans.

As a matter of fact these funds are actually going into business. The ordinary markets have been closed during the past two years to the railroads and industry in general because of lack of confidence on the part of investors constituting these markets. As a result, the railroads and other corporations have had to seek loans necessary for their legitimate operation from extraordinary sources, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

A return of some measure of confidence in the investment markets as is expressed by a resumption of bond buying is, in my opinion, a most encouraging sign and not, as Mr. Hirschfeld states, "most regrettable."

In the final analysis a bond simply represents a loan to industry, a long-term loan. It is true that most outstanding bonds represent loans long since advanced to industry. But the significant aspect of a rising market stimulated by increased buying power is that it tends to raise the bond-market price level to a point where much-needed new financing becomes possible. Bonds cannot be sold in a demoralized market. A strong market results in the thawing out of frozen bond accounts of banks and insurance companies, thus liberating tremendous sums for new financing of both the long and short variety. It further obviates, particularly in the present instance, the necessity of the Government using the taxpayers' money in a gigantic financial rescue mission, thus hastening the day when Federal expenditures are brought down to the level of income. There is no more vital economic problem before us today than the permanent balancing of the national budget.

Let us hope that the present trend in the bond market continues so that it will become possible to finance the restoration and improvement to plant and equipment and provide a demand for materials and labor so sorely needed, even by the consumer.

Philadelphia.

THOMAS E. MORRIS.

Ten Greatest Catholic Women

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Two of your correspondents in the issue of January 7, although handling different topics, awoke one and the same reflection in the mind of this old timer and, I hope, in that of many others of your readers. Both correspondents happily are grateful to our ancestors in the Faith here in America and solicitous that their names should not be forgotten.

The first tells us of Frank Hurd of Toledo, Ohio, and how he was invited to a place in Cleveland's Cabinet. I recall reading in the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, just fifty years ago, the statement that if Frank Hurd would put aside his "copper Jesus" he could be president of the United States. That irreverent remark of the *Enquirer's* columnist, who signed himself "Ithuriel," aroused a desire to know more about Frank Hurd, which desire your correspondent at this late day has not only not satisfied but has augmented.

Your second correspondent, Ethel King, suggested a Catholic "Ten Greatest Women," meaning the ten greatest Catholic women of the United States of the last hundred years. I hope it caused no regret that no Catholic name appeared in the original "Ten Greatest" who were chosen by the readers of a secular journal some time ago, for the absence of Catholic names in that roster merely indicates that Catholics form no large percentage of said journal's clientele. Of course, among Catholics those are truly the greatest who are the least, and from every point of view the founders of our American Religious Orders, like Mother Spalding, for instance, or any one of the nuns who are devoting their lives to the lepers in our National Leprosarium in Louisiana or in any other loathsome place, far surpass in true womanly greatness any of the original ten. Miss King's list is a good one. But it limits itself to just two classes, nuns and authors, five of each. It seems a challenge. Here are two more classes, wives and mothers, champions also in the cause of God: Mrs. Edward Creighton, first benefactress of our higher education; Mary Anderson (Mrs. Navarro), premier brilliant of America's dramatic stage; Mrs. Sarah Peter, who went to Rome to convert Pius IX and returned to America with a community of contemplative nuns to convert us all; Mrs. William T. Sherman, whose genuine Catholicism shining in the high places of the land lighted the nation; Mrs. Madeleine Vinton Dahlgren, so long the queen of elegance in word and deed; Mrs. Bellamy Storer, leader in ceramic and other arts; Mrs. Nelson O'Shaughnessy, first defender of the Church in Mexico. Then there is the mother of the American Machabees—five priests and two nuns—Mrs. Hickey, of Cincinnati. Finally, I once heard Father Walter H. Hill, S.J., President of St. Xavier College, Cincinnati, say casually, "If my mother were now alive, she might count a thousand good Catholic descendants." The remark seemed to me at the time a huge exaggeration, but years later I saw the names and addresses of that thousand and more in a volume compiled by John Hill, a nephew of Father Hill. Surely here was a valiant woman.

Here are ten valiant women. I observe that I happen to have found all ten in the Ohio Valley. Perhaps this too is a challenge. If these and Miss King's list be not America's greatest, they are certainly names that should live in Catholic hearts. And may our men of brave sacrifices, such as Frank Hurd, be also in perpetual memory among us.

Detroit.

JOHN K. LAURENCE.

Tribute

To the Editor of AMERICA:

A great and fine soul has gone to her reward in the person of Elizabeth Christitch. I have just returned from the poignant scene in the crypt of St. Etheldreda's, Ely Place, where a few faithful friends, amongst whom were some eight or ten priests, foregathered to assist at the Requiem Mass and Absolution.

I cannot refrain from calling attention to a woman and a life that have left a mark and done God's work, especially amongst English-speaking and Serbian people. Her pilgrimage has been indeed one full of sadness and struggle, and withal of great zeal and accomplishment.

The *Times*, January 28, recalled some of her writings and doings. But the list is a mere skeleton and gives no idea of the wonderful mind and character of this Irish woman, whom to know was to love, reverence, and lament.

The present writer owes her a debt of gratitude he cannot repay but which he hopes yet to justify by remembering and by allowing the seed she sowed to fructify in his own life.

To converse with her was an inspiration, and one left her determined to be real and to tear away from all conventional nonsense.

May she rest in peace, and may we not rest until we are as honest and straightforward and ready to suffer for justice sake as was she—the fearless champion of the mother and the child. Her children—God bless them—will rise up and call her blessed, for few are privileged as they.

Watford, England.

A. JACKMAN.